466-A-3

ED 1.310/2:285966

JUN 0 8 1988

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED285366

COMPLETED

57

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES TARGETED IN INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAMS DEVELOPED FOR EXCEPTIONAL LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT AND ENGLISH PROFICIENT HISPANIC STUDENTS

Cheryl Y. Wilkinson, Ann C. Willig and Alba A. Ortiz

This is a report of a research study examining individualized education plans for learning disabled and mentally retarded Hispanic students. It is part of a four-year study designed to develop training modules for teachers of handicapped limited English proficient children. (U.S. Department of Education, Contract No. 300-83-0272).

The Handicapped Minority Research Institute on Language Proficiency
Department of Special Education
College of Education
The University of Texas at Austin

April, 1986

EC200455

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ORIGINAL

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 366 EC 200 455

AUTHOR Wilkinson, Cheryl Y.; And Others
TITLE Goals and Objectives Targeted in Individualized Education Programs Developed for Exceptional Limited English Proficient and English Proficient Hispanic Students.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Dept. of Special Education.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Apr 86
CONTRACT 300-83-0272
NOTE 56p.; Some data tables contain small print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; *Hispanic Americans; *Individualized Education Programs; Intervention; Language of Instruction; *Learning Disabilities; *Limited English Speaking; *Mild Mental Retardation; Objectives; State Standards; *Student Educational Objectives
IDENTIFIERS Texas

ABSTRACT

The study was designed to identify (1) the academic and behavioral areas most often addressed in the Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) of limited English proficient (LEP) and English proficient (non-LEP) mildly handicapped Hispanic students; and (2) the priority rankings assigned by Admission, Review and Dismissal committees to each area. Data were collected from IEPs of 396 Hispanic children in grades 1 through 6 in three Texas districts, and an instrument was devised to code common categories for goals and objectives. Results indicated that reading, written expression and spelling were the goal areas most frequently specified for learning disabled (LD) children across districts. The most frequently listed categories were all reading related, and included word attack skills, passage comprehension, and word recognition. Goals for LD LEP and non-LEP children were similar both within and across districts. Data for mentally retarded LEP and non-LEP Hispanic students suggested that although all of the districts gave priority to developing the academic skills of mentally retarded students, districts also stressed more basic language and social skills. Few references to language of instruction were found. Implications addressed include the need to adapt IEP forms for students with limited English proficiency and to have state-developed minimum compliance standards to assure that IEPs address not only the handicapping conditon but linguistic, cultural, and other sociocultural variables as well. References and 18 data tables are included. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Acknowledgements

These faculty, staff and students of the Handicapped Minority Research Institute on Language Proficiency and of the Bilingual Special Education Training Program participated in the collection and analyses of data (listed in alphabetical order):

Evah Leigh Baker

Maria Bentsen Bohner

Naomi Breed

Norma Cardenas

Lucy Cruz

Shernaz B. Garcia

Aixa Hernandez-Pound

Wayne H. Holtzman, Jr.

Dahri McFaline

Eleoussa Polyzoi

William E. Snell, Jr.

Deborah Valdez

Rosario Villegas

We also gratefully acknowledge Lyn Brown and Rosemary F. Murphy for their assistance in the preparation of this report.

The research reported herein was supported by the U.S. Department of Education (Contract No. 300-83-0272). However, the opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement by the Department should be inferred.

Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables	iv
List of Figures	v
Introduction	1
Purpose	2
Previous Research on IEPs	2
Research Questions	3
Method	
Sample	4
Development of the Data Collection Instrument	4
Data Collection	13
Data Analysis	14
Results and Discussion	
Most Frequently Targeted Areas for LD LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Children	14
Differences in Educational Goals for LD LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Children	23
Most Frequently Targeted Areas for MR LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Children	28
Differences in Educational Goals for MR LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Children	28
Use of Spanish as the Language of Instruction for Handicapped Hispanic Children	41
Implications of IEP Findings for the Longitudinal Intervention Study	41
Implications for Policy, Practice, and Research	
Native Language Assessment	42
Dual Language Instruction for the Handicapped	42
IEP Committees	45
Adaptation for IEP Forms	45
Instructional Strategies	46
Program Models	46
Specialized Curricula and Materials	46
State Policy	47
General Recommendations for Research	47
Conclusions	48
References	49

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	LEP Status of Learning Disabled and Mentally Retarded Students Included in the IEP Sample	5
2.	Secondary Handicaps Assigned to Children in the IEP Sample by LEP Status	6
3.	Mean Priority Rankings of IEP Goals for LEP and Non-LEP Learning Disabled Students by District	15
4.	Number and Percentage of LEP and Non-LEP Learning Disabled Students Whose IEPs Listed Each of 21 Goals by District	16
5.	Mean Numbear of IEP Objectives by Category for Learning Disabled LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students by District	17
6.	Number and Percentage of Learning Disabled LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students Whose IEPs Contained Objectives in Each of 56 Categories by District	20
7.	Five Most Frequently Listed IEP Goals for Learning Disabled LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students	24
8.	IEP Goals for LD LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students With the Five Highest Mean Priority Rankings in Rank Order by District	25
9.	Most Frequently Listed Objectives for Learning Disabled LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students in Rank Order by District (First 10 Objectives)	26
10.	Categories for Which the Greatest Numbers of Objectives Were Written for LD LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students in Rank Order by District (First 10 Objectives)	27
11.	Mean Priority Rankings of IEP Goals for LEP and Non-LEP Mentally Retarded Students by District	29
12.	Number and Percentage of LEP and Non-LEP Mentally Retarded Students Whose IEPs Listed Each of 21 Goals by District	30
13.	Mean Number of IEP Objectives by Category for Mentally Retarded LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students by District	31
14.	Number and Percentage of Mentally Retarded LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students Whose IEPs Contained Objectives in Each of 56 Categories	34
15.	Five Most Frequently Listed IEP Goals for Mentally Retarded LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students	37

Table Page

16. IEP Goals for MR LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students With the Five Highest Mean Priority Rankings in Rank Order by District 38

17. Most Frequently Listed Objectives for Mentally Retarded LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students in Rank Order by District (First 10 Objectives) 39

18. Categories for Which the Greataest Numbers of Objectives Were Written for MR LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students in Rank Order by District (First 10 Objectives) 40

List of Figures

Figure

1. IEP Data Collection Form and Coding Categories 7

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES TARGETED IN INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAMS DEVELOPED FOR EXCEPTIONAL LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT AND ENGLISH PROFICIENT HISPANIC STUDENTS

Introduction

The ethnic composition of schools, and of special education populations has changed greatly over the last 10 years. In Texas, for example, Hispanics comprise 28% of the school population, representing an increase of 33.5 per cent between 1973 and 1983. During the same 10 years, the Black population remained stable, and the white non-Hispanic population decreased by 6.4%. Thirty percent of the Texas special education population is Hispanic, with the majority of students labeled learning disabled (58%), speech and language handicapped (20%) and mentally retarded (19%) (Ortiz & Yates, 1983). These demographic data suggest that school personnel must develop the teaching and administrative skills needed to work with minority populations in both regular and special education programs. One area of need is the identification of teaching practices which are effective for exceptional Hispanic students. Existing research describing such practices is nearly non-existent (Ortiz, 1984).

The Handicapped Minority Research Institute on Language Proficiency (HMRI) at The University of Texas at Austin is currently conducting a 4-stage, 4-year research study to identify, document and develop effective intervention strategies for use with learning disabled (LD) and mildly mentally retarded (MR) limited English proficient (LEP) Hispanic students. The first stage of the study consisted of three parts: (a) the identification of promising intervention strategies through a review of bilingual and special education research literature, (b) the identification of the areas which are most frequently the targets of intervention through an analysis of students' Individualized Educational Programs (IEPs), and (c) the identification of additional promising instructional strategies and important target areas through a series of interviews and classroom observations of monolingual and bilingual special education teachers who serve LEP handicapped students.

The second stage of the research consists of the development of a taxonomy of intervention practices used with LEP handicapped students based on both the results of Stage 1 and on a second series of classroom observations and interviews. Stage 2 uses a grounded theory approach, and incorporates the ethnographic techniques described by Glaser and Strauss (1967).

The third stage of the research will involve the development of training modules concerning the promising intervention practices identified in Stages 1 and 2 for teachers of LD and mildly MR LEP children. These modules will be developed in collaboration with teachers of LEP handicapped children, who will try out and modify the intervention strategies and module content. Videotaped observations of lessons in

which selected strategies are used will provide the basis for collaborative activites.

The fourth and final stage of the research will involve a formal evaluation of the modules and strategies using uninitiated teachers and their classrooms. Both monolingual and bilingual special education teachers will participate in the evaluation.

At present, Stage 1 of the research has been completed, and Stage 2 is in progress. This report presents the results of the second Stage 1 activity, that is, the identification of the areas which are most frequently identified as the foci of Hispanic children's special education instruction in their IEPs.

Purpose

For the intervention modules to be developed during Year 3 of the HMRI's longitudinal intervention study to be of most use to teachers of handicapped Hispanic children, the teaching strategies which the modules present should be applicable to the areas which are most frequently the focus of special education instruction. One source of information for the identification of these target areas is the Individualized Educational Program required by federal and state of Texas regulations for each child who receives special education services. Federal regulations (as described by Texas Education Agency, 1983, p. 61) require that the IEP include (a) a statement of the child's present educational performance levels; (b) a statement of annual goals and short-term objectives; (c) a statement of services to be provided, including the extent to which the child will participate in regular education programs; (d) the starting date and anticipated duration of services; and (e) a statement of evaluation criteria for the child's program. Texas State Board of Education (SBOE) rules (Texas Education Agency, 1983, p. 61-62), which refer to the Individualized Educational Program as the Individual Educational Plan (also IEP), add the following requirements to the IEP's contents: (a) a statement of present competencies taken from assessment data; (b) educational priorities for annual goals; (c) short-term objectives which are measureable, intermediate steps designed to lead to annual goal achievement; (d) a statement of the amount of time to be spent in each educational setting; (e) the position responsible for the provision of each service; (f) the modifications needed for the student to be successful in his/her program and the schedule for the program's evaluation; and (g) the signatures of the committee which established the program along with an indication of each member's agreement or disagreement with its contents. SBOE rules also require that a child's IEP be kept as a part of the special education eligibility folder.

Previous Research on IEPs

Empirical data about the contents of children's IEPs are extremely limited. Several studies which have focused on IEPs (e.g., Schenck & Levy, 1979; Pyecha et al., 1980; Safer & Hobbs, 1980) have mainly considered the issue of compliance with federal policy. These studies

have examined areas such as participants in the IEP process, the number of required elements which IEPs incorporate, and the relationship between assessment results and IEP goals. In general, the studies cited above conclude that children's IEPs do comply with federal policy.

Studies which have considered the areas targeted in IEP goals and objectives report fairly consistent results. Pyecha et al. (1980) examined a sample of 1,657 IEPs written for children 3 through 21 years of age from 42 states. Sixty percent of IEPs written for children in regular school facilities had at least one goal in the area of reading/oral English/written English; 62% of IEPs had at least one objective which fell into this area. Other frequently targeted areas included math (set as a goal in 43% of IEPs and as an objective in 46%), other academic areas (set as a goal in 32% of IEPs and as an objective in 31%), speech (set as a goal in 28% of IEPs) and social adaptation (set as a goal in 21% of IEPs). Turner and Macy (cited in Safer & Hobbs, 1980) examined objectives from a sample of IEPs written in Dallas, Texas and found that 57% fell into the area of language arts (including reading). Thirty percent of objectives concerned math, with the remaining objectives distributed as follows: behavior (4%), history (2%), social areas (2%), perception (1%), basic concepts (1%), and other areas (2%). Finally, McCormick and Fisher (1983) examined IEP goals for 300 learning disabled children in resource and self-contained special education classrooms in the Fairfax, Virginia area. The most frequently set goals for both groups included basic reading skills, English language arts and math calculation. Despite their differences in samples and geographical locations, all three studies report that the IEPs examined mainly emphasize the areas of language arts and math.

These results, however, may not be descriptive of goals set for the Hispanic and/or LEP handicapped child. In reviewing available literature about IEPs, Bickel (1982), notes the paucity of data concerning the actual goals and objectives specified in children's IEPs, and further points out that "no research was found that directly examined the question of whether the content of an IEP (especially short- and long-term goals) varies by race" (p. 208). Additionally, no previous study has considered the influence of English language proficiency on IEP content.

Research Questions

This study was undertaken to identify: (a) the academic and behavioral areas which are most often addressed in the Individual Educational Plans (IEPs) of limited English proficient (LEP) and English proficient (non-LEP) learning disabled and mentally retarded Hispanic students, and (b) the priority rankings assigned by Admission, Review and Dismissal (ARD) committees to each area. The following research questions were addressed:

1. What academic and behavioral areas are most frequently targeted as goals and objectives in IEPs written for learning disabled LEP and non-LEP Hispanic children?

2. Are there differences between the educational goals set for LEP and for non-LEP learning disabled Hispanic students?

3. What academic and behavioral areas are most frequently targeted as goals and objectives in IEPs written for mentally retarded LEP and non-LEP Hispanic children?

4. Are there differences between the educational goals set for LEP and for non-LEP mentally retarded Hispanic students?

5. How frequently, and for what goals and objectives, is Spanish specified as the language of instruction for handicapped Hispanic students?

Method

Sample

Data were collected from the IEPs of a total of 396 Hispanic children enrolled in grades one through six in three large urban school districts in south central Texas. Three-hundred and fourteen of the children had a primary handicap of learning disability and 82 had a primary handicap of mental retardation. These classifications were made by children's ARD committees. All children were a part of the original sample for a study which investigated the characteristics of limited English proficient Hispanic children enrolled in special education programs (Ortiz et al., 1985). LEP status was determined from district records at the time that sample was drawn. LEP status of the sample is detailed in Table 1, and secondary handicaps assigned to both groups are shown in Table 2.

Development of the Data Collection Instrument

IEP forms from districts participating in the study were examined to determine the procedures used in writing IEPs and the types of goals and objectives commonly set. Procedures varied among districts. District 1 wrote goals and objectives for each child by hand at the time of the ARD meeting, while Districts 2 and 3 used IEP checklists. District 2's checklist consisted of a compilation of approximately 900 objectives arranged by goal area and taken from a preset curriculum, while District 3 used a checklist which contained 28 possible goals and 373 possible areas in which objectives might be set.

Checklists from Districts 2 and 3 and the results of an examination of approximately 35 IEPs from District 1 were used to design coding categories for goals and objectives which would be common across districts and which would encompass the majority of goals and objectives set for handicapped Hispanic children. The initial set of categories was pilot tested in District 1 and revised as needed. The final data collection form, which includes 19 types of goals and 56 categories for objectives, as well as background information collected about each subject, is shown in Figure 1. Two new goals were added during coding, yielding a total of 21 goals.

Table 1

LEP Status of Learning Disabled and Mentally Retarded Students Included in the IEP Sample

District	Group		
	LEP	Non-LEP	Total
Learning disabled			
1	34	108	142
2	55	0	55
3	79	38	117
TOTAL	168	146	314
Mentally retarded			
1	0	34	34
2	27	5	32
3	8	8	16
TOTAL	35	47	82

Table 2

Secondary Handicaps Assigned to Children in the IEP Sample by LEP Status

Secondary handicapping condition	District 1 LEP # (%)	District 1 Non-LEP # (%)	District 2 LEP # (%)	District 2 Non-LEP # (%)	District 3 LEP # (%)	District 3 Non-LEP # (%)
Learning disabled						
SH	11 (32.4)	33 (30.6)	19 (34.5)	N/A[a]	56 (70.9)	15 (39.5)
VH	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	N/A	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
OHI	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	N/A	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
None/no info.	23 (67.6)	75 (69.4)	36 (65.5)	N/A	23 (29.1)	23 (60.5)
TOTAL	34(100.0)	108(100.0)	55(100.0)	N/A	79(100.0)	38(100.0)
Mentally retarded						
LD	N/A	1 (2.9)	1 (3.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
SH	N/A	24 (70.6)	8 (29.6)	2 (40.0)	6 (75.0)	8(100.0)
VH	N/A	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (20.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
OHI	N/A	1 (2.9)	1 (3.7)	0 (0.0)	2 (25.0)	0 (0.0)
None/no info.	N/A	8 (23.5)	17 (63.0)	2 (40.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
TOTAL	N/A	34(100.0)	27(100.0)	5(100.0)	8(100.0)	8(100.0)

[a]N/A = No children were available for this group in this district

HANDICAPPED MINORITY RESEARCH INSTITUTE HMRI ID _____

IEP DATA

(Collect for 83-84 year in Special Education)
Note: At times, some pages of an IEP will be filed with information from other years. Be sure to check dates on all IEP pages in a folder.

I. GENERAL INFORMATION Card 1

1. HMRI ID ——— (1 2 3 4 5)
2. Sp. Ed. ID ——— (6 7 8 9 10 11)
3. Data Collector _____ (12 13)
4. Date of Collection (month/day/year) ——— (14 15 16 17 18 19)
5. School District (1=AISD 2=SAISD 3=EISD) ——— (20)
6. Date of IEP (month/day/year) ——— (21 22 23 24 25 26)
7. Primary Handicap (at time of this IEP) (1=LD 2=SH 3=MR) ——— (27)
8. Secondary Handicap (at time of this IEP) (1=LD 2=SH 3=MR 4=none or no info) ——— (28)
9. School ——— (29 30 31)
10. Grade Level at time of this IEP (0=unclassified) ——— (32)

I. GOALS

Below is a list of possible goals to be found on the IEP. Use the prioritized annual goal found on the page where committee members sign the ARD. If this space is blank, use the goals written at the top of the first page of the IEP.

Find the goals that most closely match those listed on the IEP. If there is no match for a given goal and you are unable to code it, write the goal out at the end of this form and identify it as an uncodeable goal. Code each of the goals with:

1, 2, 3, 4, etc. = priority level

0 = goal listed but no priority level given or it is prioritized separately as a related service, e. g., under "speech"

'.' = goal not listed

Note: Sometimes one goal will have two parts that can be coded separately, such as "To improve oral and written expression." Code this goal under both categories.

1. Math (non-specific, increase skill level, etc.) (33)
2. Math calculation ——— (34)
3. Math reasoning ——— (35)
4. Reading (non-specific, basic reading skills, increase skill level, basic reading skills, etc) (36)
5. Reading comprehension ——— (37)

№

Figure 1. IEP data collection form and coding categories.

HMRI ID _____

6. Language arts ———————————— (__) 36
7. Spelling skills ———————————— (__) 38
8. Written expression, written language ———— (__) 40
9. Oral expression, expressive language skills, language development or language ———— (__) 41
10. Listening comprehension or receptive language —— (__) 42
11. Social studies ———————————— (__) 43
12. Science and health (knowledge and/or grooming) — (__) 44
13. Social/behavioral (self-concept) ———— (__) 45
14. Speech (articulation, voice, rhythm) ———— (__) 46
15. Motor development, non-specific ———— (__) 47
16. Fine motor or visual motor skill development —— (__) 48
17. Gross motor skill development ———— (__) 49
18. Self-help skills (dressing, feeding, etc.) ——— (__) 50
19. General readiness skills ———— (__) 51

III. OBJECTIVES

Below is a list of possible objectives. Match each objective on the IEP with one on this list. Since there may be multiple matching objectives, use the following system:

— Keep track of the number of IEP objectives that match each objective below. This can be done prior to completing the code column by making a mark beside each objective below for every IEP objective that matches.

— Once you have identified and marked all matches, total the number of marks for each objective and enter this total in the coding brackets.

— Enter "." for all objectives that are not used.

Figure 1. (continued)

HRRI ID _____

Math Objectives

1. Non-specific, increase skill level, etc. ——— (__) 81
2. General math calculations, or type of calculation not specified ——— (__) 83
3. Pre-computation math operations (counting, writing numbers in sequence, reading numbers, etc.) ——— (__) 84
4. Perform addition or subtraction math operations (includes regrouping) ——— (__) 85
5. Perform multiplication or division math operations ——— (__) 86
6. Perform math operations with fractions or decimals ——— (__) 87
7. Perform math computations from oral or written word problems designed to increase math reasoning skills;
   time and measurement operations
   (Note: just telling time or reading calendar is #54) ——— (__) 88
8. Perform consumer math applications;
   learn to recognize money;
   operations with money such as correct change, etc. ——— (__) 89

Reading Objectives

9. Reading (non-specific, increase skill level) ——— (__) 80
10. Increase reading readiness skills (learn alphabet;
    write alphabet in sequence;
    recognize letters, etc.) ——— (__) 81
11. Increase performance in word recognition or
    increase reading vocabulary,
    sight words, read common signs,
    direction words, abbreviations;
    match like words;
    learn Dolch words, etc.) ——— (__) 82
12. Increase performance in phonetic, structural or contextual
    word attack skills (sounding out words, syllables, etc;
    getting words from context;
    decoding words;
    learn blends;
    learn CVC rules) ——— (__) 83
13. Improve reading rate ——— (__) 84
14. Improve oral reading ——— (__) 85

Reading Comprehension Objectives

15. Improve passage comprehension skills,
    read and discuss,
    answer questions about passage read by student,
    give main ideas, etc. ——— (__) 86
16. Improve reference skills: includes alphabetizing,
    use dictionary,
    use encyclopedia,
    use guide words, etc. ——— (__) 87

Figure 1. (continued)

MRI ID _____

Spelling Objectives

17. Improve general spelling skills (spell sight and other words) ——— (__) 68

18. Use basic phonics skills in spelling (spell by breaking a word down to basic sounds; use blends to spell; spell from root words) ——— (__) 69

Writing Objectives

19. Improve written expression, non-specific ——— (__) 70

20. Improve handwriting or printing (includes individual letters, words, numbers, write in cursive; write in manuscript, copy from board, etc.) ——— (__) 71

21. Write personal data info (name, address, etc.) (Note: Reciting personal data is 046) ——— (__) 72

22. Increase capitalization and/or punctuation skills ——— (__) 73

23. Increase sentence-writing skills ——— (__) 74

24. Increase paragraph, essay or report writing skills ——— (__) 75

25. Improve written grammar and syntax (Ex: Identify parts of speech such as nouns and verbs or correct word order) ——— (__) 76

Oral Expression and Speech Objectives

26. Improve expressive language skills or language development (talk more, produce sentences re some topic, etc.) ——— (__) 77

(^ 0 1) 78 79 80

CARD 2 (__ __ __ __ __) 1 2 3 4 5

27. Improve pronunciation, articulation or auditory discrimination; use or blend sounds correctly; pronounce specific letters or sounds such as 'd', 'th', etc.; correct a lisp; (Note that blending sounds in conjunction with a reading goal should be coded as a phonetic word attack skill) (__) 6

28. Increase spoken or oral vocabulary ——— (__) 7

29. Improve oral grammar and syntax (Ex: Use prepositions, verbs, or other parts of speech in sentences; produce grammatical patterns such as NVN) ——— (__) 8

30. Speak in complete sentences (spontaneously produced) ——— (__) 9

31. Relate events or a story in sequence ——— (__) 10

32. Improve voice (pitch, intonation, rhythm, volume) ——— (__) 11

33. Improve fluency (includes repeating sentences) ——— (__) 12

Listening Comprehension or Receptive Language Objectives

34. Improve receptive language or listening skills, non-specific (Note: If passage is read by student and student answers questions, code as 015. If passage is read by other to student, code here.) ——— (__) 13

35. Improve memory (Ex: Remember verbal directions, sentences, syllables; improve attention skills) ——— (__) 14

Figure 1. (continued)

MMRI ID _____

Motor Development

36. Increase fine motor skills (tracking, grasping, visual motor or perceptual motor, manipulation, cutting, pasting, etc.) ——— (__) 36

37. General body coordination: midline training skills; balance, coordination, etc. ——— (__) 36

38. Gross motor skills: standing, walking, gym, sports, dance, etc. ——— (__) 37

Self Help Objectives

39. Dressing skills ——— (__) 38

40. Eating and feeding skills ——— (__) 39

41. Toileting skills ——— (__) 40

General Readiness Objectives

42. Sequencing ideas or events (nonverbal) ——— (__) 41

43. Color recognition ——— (__) 42

44. Body awareness (identify parts, etc.) ——— (__) 43

45. Directional, positional skills (know up, over, above, etc.) ——— (__) 44

46. Recite personal data (name, address, phone, etc.) ——— (__) 45

47. Temporal knowledge (days of week, months, calendar dates, etc.) ——— (__) 46

48. Categorization (group and label pictures or objects, recognize similarities and differences; Note: Matching words is coded as #11.) ——— (__) 47

Additional Objectives

49. Improve knowledge in social studies ——— (__) 48

50. Improve knowledge in science and health (and/or grooming) ——— (__) 49

51. Improve visual discrimination ——— (__) 50

Social/Behavioral Objectives

52. Improve self-concept ——— (__) 51

53. Increase assertiveness skills ——— (__) 52

54. Increase responsible behavior ——— (__) 53

55. Increase appropriate interactions with peers, adults and environment; (general non-verbal, such as participate in play, engage in eye contact, etc.) ——— (__) 54

56. Increase social communication skills; (also be able to express and recognize feelings) ——— (__) 55

****

BE SURE TO COMPLETE LAST SECTION, PAGE 6

****

Figure 1. (continued)

NDRI ID _____

IV. Concerning the language in which goals and objectives are to be accomplished, code here using the following codes: _____ (__) 38

1= The use of Spanish is not mentioned in any way.

2= It is mentioned that Spanish (or bilingualism) will be used for some objectives, but does not specify for which objectives or when or where it is to be used.

3= All objectives are to be worked on in Spanish.

4= Spanish will be used for one or more, but not all of the objectives. If this is the case, list below the numbers that identify which objectives are to be worked on in Spanish.—— (__ __) 39 40
(__ __) 41 42
(__ __) 43 44
(__ __) 45 46

SKIP TO COL. #79

(0 2) 78 80

Figure 1. (continued)

Data Collection

Permission was obtained from cooperating school districts to examine a sample of Hispanic students' special education eligibility folders. These folders included IEP and ARD records. In two districts, folders were housed in a central office where data collection took place; in the third, data were collected at each subject's school.

Data were collected from IEPs written at the child's 1983-84 ARD meeting. Information recorded from each IEP included: (a) the educational goals recommended by the ARD committee, (b) the priority ranking of each goal, and (c) the number of objectives which fell into each of the 56 predefined categories. Any indication that instruction, for some or all of a child's goals or objectives, was to take place in Spanish was also noted. Because the data available for each district differed slightly, data collection procedures for each district are presented separately.

Coder Training. HMRI faculty trained two data collectors in the use of the coding system described above. Coders practiced coding a series of goals and objectives which had been collected from District 1 IEPs during pilot testing of the coding system. Objectives were coded in sets of about 50. After each set was coded, coding categories were discussed by the coders and two HMRI staff trainers to assure accuracy in classification of goals and objectives. Each coder then coded 5 IEPs selected at random from the District 1 sample; these IEPs were also coded by the second coder and by both HMRI trainers. Further feedback about the use of the coding categories was provided as these IEPs were coded.

District 1. IEPs from District 1 were coded directly onto the data collection form shown in Figure 1. IEPs were coded by both coders, each working independently of the other. They then compared their separate codings. Any goal or objective which they were unable to classify, or on which they could not reach consensus, was written out in full on the data collection form and later coded by both trainers. These procedures insured that the category assigned to any goal or objective was agreed upon by at least two persons trained in the use of the IEP coding system.

District 2. IEPs for District 2 contained goals and objectives which were taken from the curriculum used in the district's Special Education classes. Each objective had been assigned a unique number which identified content area, level, and the specific objective. During data collection, objective numbers were copied for each child, along with any additional objectives that were written by the ARD committee. A master list of objectives and their numbers was obtained from the district and was coded by the two HMRI trainers. This master list was used to assign each child's objectives to the 56 categories. Goals for this district were coded by the same coders who had coded data for District 1, using the same procedures as were used in that district.

District 3. IEPs for District 3 consisted of checklists on which various goals and subgoals were selected for each child. Unlike the previous two districts, District 3's eligibility folders did not contain either priority rankings of goals or a full listing of objectives. Rather, the checklists defined the specific areas in which priorities and

objectives would be set. For example, while children in the other two districts might have an objective such as "child will learn to add two-digit numbers with no regrouping," children in District 3 would simply have the area "addition" checked. Therefore, it was not possible to obtain the exact number of objectives within each category for each child.

Data collection for this district consisted of recording the goals and subgoals selected for each child. These goals and subgoals were then assigned to the coding scheme used in the other two districts by the two trainers.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using subprograms from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS; Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1975). Analyses included tabulation of the number of children for whom each goal and objective had been set, the mean priority ranking of each goal and the mean number of objectives set in each category. Analyses were carried out separately for each district.

Results and Discussion

Indicators of the areas most often targeted in the IEPs of handicapped Hispanic children were calculated from the data described above. These indicators included: (a) the mean priority ranking of each goal, (b) the number and percentage of children for whom a particular goal was set (regardless of its priority ranking), (c) the mean number of objectives in the IEP that fell into each coding category and (d) the number and percentage of children who had objectives in a particular category (regardless of the number of objectives). Indicators b and d were available for all three districts; indicators a and c could be calculated for Districts 1 and 2 only.

Most Frequently Targeted Areas for LD LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Children

Table 3 shows the mean priority ranking for each goal for LEP and non-LEP LD children in Districts 1 and 2; Table 4 shows the number and percentage of children for whom each goal was selected for all districts. The tables suggest that reading, written expression and spelling were the goal areas most frequently specified for LD children across districts and were also the goal areas given highest priority in Districts 1 and 2.

Table 5 shows the mean number of objectives in each of the 56 categories for LD children in Districts 1 and 2; Table 6 shows the number and percentage of children from all three districts who had at least one objective in each category. Coding categories in which objectives were most frequently set were comparable across districts. The most frequently listed categories were all reading-related, and included word attack skills, passage comprehension, and word recognition. Mean numbers of objectives were highest for skills related to reading/language and motor skills in District 1 and for reading and math skills in District 2. These results are consistent with previous findings which suggest that language arts (including reading) is the area most frequently targeted in IEPs.

Table 3

Mean Priority Rankings of IEP Goals for LEP and Non-LEP Learning Disabled Students by District[a]

IEP goals	District 1 LEP (n=34) M	District 1 LEP (n=34) SD	District 1 Non-LEP (n=108) M	District 1 Non-LEP (n=108) SD	District 2 LEP (n=55) M	District 2 LEP (n=55) SD	District 2 Non-LEP (n=0) M	District 2 Non-LEP (n=0) SD
1. Math, non-specific	2.4	0.7 (8)[b]	2.8	0.9 (29)	1.8	0.8 (20)	N/A[c]	N/A
2. Math calculation	3.0	1.4 (4)	2.5	1.2 (8)	—[d]	———	N/A	N/A
3. Math reasoning	3.0	1.4 (4)	2.6	1.1 (7)	—	———	N/A	N/A
4. Reading, non-specific	1.0	0.2 (29)	1.2	0.5 (92)	1.2	0.5 (37)	N/A	N/A
5. Reading comprehension	1.0	0.0 (4)	1.2	0.5 (20)	—	———	N/A	N/A
6. Language Arts	4.0	0.0 (1)	2.2	1.2 (6)	2.1	0.9 (7)	N/A	N/A
7. Spelling skills	2.4	0.7 (13)	2.1	0.7 (53)	1.4	0.5 (5)	N/A	N/A
8. Written expression	2.2	0.5 (24)	2.2	0.7 (69)	2.4	0.9 (5)	N/A	N/A
9. Oral expression or language	3.4	1.5 (5)	2.3	1.3 (23)	1.7	0.8 (25)	N/A	N/A
10. Receptive language	2.6	1.5 (5)	2.7	1.3 (17)	1.0	0.0 (1)	N/A	N/A
11. Social studies	—	———	—	———	—	———	N/A	N/A
12. Science/health	—	———	—	———	—	———	N/A	N/A
13. Social/behavioral	3.0	0.0 (1)	4.5	1.0 (6)	—	———	N/A	N/A
14. Speech	3.6	1.1 (5)	2.9	1.3 (17)	1.6	1.0 (7)	N/A	N/A
15. Motor skills, non-specific	—	———	4.8	1.0 (4)	—	———	N/A	N/A
16. Fine or visual motor	—	———	3.0	1.0 (3)	—	———	N/A	N/A
17. Gross motor skills	—	———	3.0	1.0 (3)	—	———	N/A	N/A
18. Self-help	—	———	5.0	0.0 (1)	—	———	N/A	N/A
19. Readiness skills	—	———	—	———	—	———	N/A	N/A
20. Vocational skills	—	———	—	———	—	———	N/A	N/A
21. Study skills	—	———	—	———	—	———	N/A	N/A

Note. A ranking of 1 indicates highest priority.
[a]Priority rankings were not available for District 3.
[b]( ) = Number of children with a priority ranking for goal.
[c]N/A = No children were available for this group in this district.
[d]No child's IEP contained this goal.

Table 4

Number and Percentage of LEP and Non-LEP Learning Disabled Students Whose IEPs Listed Each of 21 Goals by District

IEP goals	District 1 LEP (n=34) # (%)	District 1 Non-LEP (n=108) # (%)	District 2 LEP (n=55) # (%)	District 2 Non-LEP (n=0) # (%)	District 3 LEP (n=79) # (%)	District 3 Non-LEP (n=38) # (%)
1. Math, non-specific	8 (23.5)	29 (26.9)	29 (52.7)	N/A[a]	—[b] ------	— ------
2. Math calculation	4 (11.8)	8 (7.4)	0 (0.0)	N/A	56 (70.9)	28 (73.7)
3. Math reasoning	4 (11.8)	7 (6.5)	0 (0.0)	N/A	54 (68.4)	25 (65.8)
4. Reading, non-specific	29 (85.3)	92 (35.2)	47 (85.5)	N/A	71 (89.9)	33 (86.8)
5. Reading comprehension	4 (11.8)	20 (18.5)	0 (0.0)	N/A	65 (82.3)	31 (81.6)
6. Language arts	1 (2.9)	6 (5.6)	9 (16.4)	N/A	— ------	— ------
7. Spelling skills	13 (38.2)	53 (49.1)	5 (9.1)	N/A	65 (82.3)	32 (84.2)
8. Written expression	24 (70.6)	69 (63.9)	6 (10.9)	N/A	66 (83.5)	27 (71.0)
9. Oral expression or language	5 (14.7)	23 (21.3)	36 (65.5)	N/A	50 (63.3)	17 (44.7)
10. Receptive language	5 (14.7)	17 (15.7)	2 (3.6)	N/A	39 (49.4)	10 (26.3)
11. Social studies	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	N/A	10 (12.7)	3 (7.9)
12. Science/health	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	N/A	9 (11.4)	2 (5.3)
13. Social/behavioral	1 (2.9)	9 (8.3)	0 (0.0)	N/A	27 (34.2)	13 (34.2)
14. Speech	5 (14.7)	17 (15.7)	8 (14.5)	N/A	9 (11.4)	2 (5.3)
15. Motor skills, non-specific	0 (0.0)	4 (3.7)	0 (0.0)	N/A	— ------	— ------
16. Fine or visual motor	0 (0.0)	3 (2.8)	0 (0.0)	N/A	2 (2.5)	1 (2.6)
17. Gross motor skills	0 (0.0)	3 (2.8)	0 (0.0)	N/A	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
18. Self-help	0 (0.0)	1 (0.9)	0 (0.0)	N/A	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
19. Readiness skills	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	N/A	— ------	— ------
20. Vocational skills	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	N/A	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
21. Study skills	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	N/A	9 (11.4)	4 (10.5)

[a]N/A = No children were available for this group in this district.
[b]Goal not used by this district.

Table 5

Mean Number of IEP Objectives by Category for Learning Disabled LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students by District[a]

IEP objectives	District 1 LEP (n=34) M	SD	District 1 Non-LEP (n=108) M	SD	District 2 LEP (n=55) M	SD	District 2 Non-LEP (n=0) M	SD
Math objectives								
1. Non-specific	1.3	0.6(3)[b]	1.8	0.9(19)	1.0	0.0(3)	N/A[c]	
2. Calculations, non-specific	1.0	0.0(1)	2.0	0.0(1)	----------[d]		N/A	
3. Pre-computation	1.4	0.9(5)	2.0	1.0(14)	6.8	8.1(21)	N/A	
4. Add/subtract	1.5	0.9(8)	1.9	1.0(27)	4.9	2.9(17)	N/A	
5. Multiply/divide	1.6	0.5(7)	2.1	1.0(21)	2.0	1.0(3)	N/A	
6. Fractions/decimals	1.0	0.0(1)	2.0	1.4(4)	1.5	0.6(6)	N/A	
7. Reasoning/word problems	1.0	0.0(1)	1.3	0.5(4)	3.1	2.0(12)	N/A	
8. Consumer applications	----------		3.0	2.7(3)	1.3	0.5(15)	N/A	
Reading objectives								
9. Non-specific	1.8	0.8(6)	1.4	0.7(31)	----------		N/A	
10. Reading readiness	3.3	1.9(4)	1.5	0.8(14)	5.1	4.5(23)	N/A	
11. Word recognition; reading vocabulary	1.5	0.7(17)	2.2	1.2(76)	2.3	1.1(28)	N/A	
12. Word attack skills	1.9	1.3(18)	2.4	1.7(38)	7.9	6.2(35)	N/A	
13. Improve reading rate	----------		----------		----------		N/A	
14. Improve oral reading	1.8	1.0(12)	1.5	0.8(33)	1.0	0.0(7)	N/A	
15. Passage comprehension	1.7	0.8(19)	1.9	0.9(48)	5.5	3.6(32)	N/A	
16. Reference skills	----------		1.3	0.6(3)	3.0	2.6(25)	N/A	
Spelling objectives								
17. General spelling	1.9	0.8(15)	2.1	1.3(52)	1.1	0.4(8)	N/A	
18. Phonics skills	1.6	0.7(9)	1.7	1.2(21)	1.0	0.0(2)	N/A	

[a] Objectives were not available for District 3.
[b] ( ) = Number of children whose IEPs contained objectives in this category.
[c] N/A = No children were available for this group in this district.
[d] No child's IEP contained this goal.

Table 5 (continued)

IEP objectives	District 1 LEP (n=34) M	SD	District 1 Non-LEP (n=108) M	SD	District 2 LEP (n=55) M	SD	District 2 Non-LEP (n=0) M	SD
Writing objectives								
19. Written expression	1.0	0.0(4)	1.4	0.5(9)	----------		N/A	
20. Handwriting or printing	2.2	1.2(9)	1.7	0.8(27)	1.4	1.1(7)	N/A	
21. Write personal data	1.9	1.5(7)	1.3	0.6(18)	1.0	0.0(4)	N/A	
22. Capitalization; punctuation	1.6	0.9(14)	2.0	1.2(49)	1.7	1.3(23)	N/A	
23. Sentence writing	1.3	0.5(8)	1.7	0.8(38)	1.0	0.0(7)	N/A	
24. Paragraph writing	1.0	0.0(5)	1.2	0.6(17)	1.0	0.0(1)	N/A	
25. Written grammar and syntax	2.5	2.4(8)	1.2	0.4(6)	6.3	6.7(3)	N/A	
Oral expression and speech								
26. Expressive language/ language development	1.8	1.0(4)	2.7	2.6(23)	3.6	5.0(22)	N/A	
27. Pronunciation, articulation, auditory discrimination	2.3	1.0(8)	2.2	1.0(25)	4.0	2.4(24)	N/A	
28. Increase spoken or oral vocabulary	----------		1.0	0.0(3)	2.6	1.8(23)	N/A	
29. Oral grammar and syntax	2.3	2.2(7)	2.5	2.1(13)	6.7	6.9(28)	N/A	
30. Speak in complete sentences	1.0	0.0(5)	1.6	1.5(11)	2.2	1.3(17)	N/A	
31. Relate story or events in sequence	1.0	0.0(1)	1.5	0.7(10)	1.5	0.7(12)	N/A	
32. Improve voice	2.0	0.0(1)	1.0	0.0(2)	1.8	1.0(4)	N/A	
33. Improve fluency	----------		1.6	0.9(5)	1.7	1.3(14)	N/A	
Receptive language/ listening comprehension								
34. Improve listening skill	2.0	0.0(6)	1.3	0.7(21)	2.3	2.7(19)	N/A	
35. Improve memory	1.0	0.0(3)	1.5	0.7(11)	1.9	2.0(13)	N/A	
Motor development								
36. Fine motor skills	----------		3.8	4.2(4)	5.0	6.4(10)	N/A	
37. General coordination	3.0	0.0(1)	2.8	1.7(4)	1.0	0.0(2)	N/A	
38. Gross motor skills	----------		1.8	0.5(5)	3.3	3.2(3)	N/A	

Table 5 (continued)

IEP objectives	District 1 LEP (n=34) M	SD	District 1 Non-LEP (n=108) M	SD	District 2 LEP (n=55) M	SD	District 2 Non-LEP (n=0) M	SD
Self-help objectives								
39. Dressing skills	----	----	3.0	0.0(1)	----	----	N/A	
40. Eating and feeding	----	----	3.0	0.0(1)	----	----	N/A	
41. Toileting	----	----	2.0	0.0(1)	----	----	N/A	
General readiness								
42. Sequencing ideas/events	----	----	----	----	1.4	0.7(9)	N/A	
43. Color recognition	----	----	1.0	0.0(2)	1.0	0.0(4)	N/A	
44. Body awareness	----	----	1.0	0.0(3)	1.7	1.1(9)	N/A	
45. Directional/ positional skills	----	----	1.3	0.6(3)	2.2	2.0(15)	N/A	
46. Recite personal data	1.0	0.0(1)	1.8	1.0(4)	1.6	1.0(11)	N/A	
47. Temporal knowledge	1.5	0.7(2)	1.5	0.6(6)	2.6	2.7(23)	N/A	
48. Categorization/ similarities	1.0	0.0(1)	2.0	1.6(10)	7.4	12.6(20)	N/A	
Additional objectives								
49. Social studies	----	----	----	----	3.0	0.0(1)	N/A	
50. Science, health, grooming	----	----	----	----	1.0	0.0(1)	N/A	
51. Visual discrimination	----	----	----	----	1.0	0.0(1)	N/A	
Social/behavioral objectives								
52. Improve self concept	1.0	0.0(1)	----	----	----	----	N/A	
53. Assertiveness skills	----	----	----	----	----	----	N/A	
54. Responsible behavior	2.0	0.0(1)	4.6	4.3(5)	----	----	N/A	
55. Appropriate social interaction	1.0	0.0(1)	1.3	0.8(6)	----	----	N/A	
56. Social communication skills	3.0	1.4(2)	1.5	0.6(6)	1.3	0.8(6)	N/A	

Table 6

Number and Percentage of Learning Disabled LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students Whose IEPs Contained Objectives in Each of 56 Categories by District

	District					
	1		2		3	
	LEP (n=34)	Non-LEP (n=108)	LEP (n=55)	Non-LEP (n=0)	LEP (n=79)	Non-LEP (n=38)
IEP objectives	# (%)	# (%)	# (%)	# (%)	# (%)	# (%)
Math objectives						
1. Non-specific	3(8.8)	19(17.6)	3(5.5)	N/A[a]	1(1.3)	1(2.6)
2. Calculations, non-specific	1(2.9)	1(0.9)	0(0.0)	N/A	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
3. Pre-computation	5(14.7)	14(13.0)	25(45.5)	N/A	20(25.3)	6(15.8)
4. Add/subtract	8(23.5)	27(25.0)	20(36.4)	N/A	52(65.8)	27(71.1)
5. Multiply/divide	7(20.6)	21(19.4)	3(5.5)	N/A	27(34.2)	12(31.6)
6. Fractions/decimals	1(2.9)	4(3.7)	8(14.5)	N/A	4(5.1)	3(7.9)
7. Reasoning/word problems	1(2.9)	4(3.7)	14(25.5)	N/A	54(68.4)	24(63.2)
8. Consumer applications	0(0.0)	3(2.8)	16(29.1)	N/A	29(36.7)	14(36.8)
Reading objectives						
9. Non-specific	6(17.6)	31(28.7)	0(0.0)	N/A	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
10. Reading readiness	4(11.8)	14(13.0)	25(45.5)	N/A	26(32.9)	6(15.8)
11. Word recognition; reading vocabulary	18(52.9)	79(73.1)	32(58.2)	N/A	71(89.9)	32(84.2)
12. Word attack skills	19(55.9)	40(37.0)	41(74.5)	N/A	60(75.9)	30(78.9)
13. Improve reading rate	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	N/A	14(17.7)	6(15.8)
14. Improve oral reading	13(38.2)	34(31.5)	7(12.7)	N/A	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
15. Passage comprehension	20(58.8)	49(45.4)	37(67.3)	N/A	50(63.3)	28(73.7)
16. Reference skills	0(0.0)	3(2.8)	29(52.7)	N/A	8(10.1)	3(7.9)
Spelling objectives						
17. General spelling	16(47.1)	53(49.1)	9(16.4)	N/A	57(72.2)	28(73.7)
18. Phonics skills	9(26.5)	22(20.4)	3(5.5)	N/A	58(73.4)	31(81.6)

[a]No children were available for this group in this district.

Table 6 (continued)

IEP objectives	District 1 LEP (n=34) # (%)	1 Non-LEP (n=108) # (%)	2 LEP (n=55) # (%)	2 Non-LEP (n=0) # (%)	3 LEP (n=79) # (%)	3 Non-LEP (n=38) # (%)
Writing objectives						
19. Written expression	4(11.8)	9(8.3)	0(0.0)	N/A	8(10.1)	4(10.5)
20. Handwriting or printing	9(26.5)	29(26.9)	9(16.4)	N/A	33(41.8)	16(42.1)
21. Write personal data	7(20.6)	18(16.7)	4(7.3)	N/A	20(25.3)	4(10.5)
22. Capitalization; punctuation	14(41.2)	51(47.2)	27(49.1)	N/A	52(65.8)	25(65.8)
23. Sentence-writing	9(26.5)	40(37.0)	7(12.7)	N/A	52(65.8)	25(65.8)
24. Paragraph writing	5(14.7)	18(16.7)	1(1.8)	N/A	16(20.3)	9(23.7)
25. Written grammar and syntax	8(23.5)	6(5.6)	3(5.5)	N/A	13(16.5)	4(10.5)
Oral expression and speech						
26. Expressive language/ language development	5(14.7)	25(23.1)	25(45.5)	N/A	28(35.4)	9(23.7)
27. Pronunciation, articulation, auditory discrimination	8(23.5)	26(24.1)	28(50.9)	N/A	23(29.1)	6(15.8)
28. Increase spoken or oral vocabulary	1(2.9)	4(3.7)	25(45.5)	N/A	49(62.0)	13(34.2)
29. Oral grammar and syntax	7(20.6)	13(12.0)	33(60.0)	N/A	49(62.0)	8(21.1)
30. Speak in complete sentences	5(14.7)	13(12.0)	19(34.5)	N/A	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
31. Relate story or events in sequence	2(5.9)	11(10.2)	15(27.3)	N/A	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
32. Improve voice	1(2.9)	2(1.9)	4(7.3)	N/A	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
33. Improve fluency	0(0.0)	6(5.6)	16(29.1)	N/A	2(2.5)	1(2.6)
Receptive language/ listening comprehension						
34. Improve listening skill	6(17.6)	21(19.4)	22(40.0)	N/A	36(45.6)	14(36.8)
35. Improve memory	3(8.8)	12(11.1)	14(25.5)	N/A	26(32.9)	12(31.6)
Motor development						
36. Fine motor skills	0(0.0)	4(3.7)	11(20.0)	N/A	3(3.8)	0(0.0)
37. General coordination	1(2.9)	4(3.7)	2(3.6)	N/A	1(1.3)	0(0.0)
38. Gross motor skills	0(0.0)	5(4.6)	3(5.5)	N/A	0(0.0)	0(0.0)

Table 6 (continued)

IEP objectives	District 1 LEP (n=34) # (%)	1 Non-LEP (n=108) # (%)	2 LEP (n=55) # (%)	2 Non-LEP (n=0) # (%)	3 LEP (n=79) # (%)	3 Non-LEP (n=38) # (%)
Self-help objectives						
39. Dressing skills	0(0.0)	1(0.9)	0(0.0)	N/A	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
40. Eating and feeding	0(0.0)	1(0.9)	0(0.0)	N/A	1(1.3)	0(0.0)
41. Toileting	0(0.0)	1(0.0)	0(0.0)	N/A	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
General readiness						
42. Sequencing ideas/events	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	11(20.0)	N/A	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
43. Color recognition	0(0.0)	2(1.9)	4(7.3)	N/A	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
44. Body awareness	0(0.0)	3(2.8)	11(20.0)	N/A	2(2.5)	0(0.0)
45. Directional/ positional skills	0(0.0)	4(3.7)	17(30.9)	N/A	6(7.6)	2(5.3)
46. Recite personal data	1(2.9)	4(3.7)	12(21.8)	N/A	1(1.3)	0(0.0)
47. Temporal knowledge	2(5.9)	6(5.6)	27(49.1)	N/A	13(16.5)	3(7.9)
48. Categorization/ similarities	1(2.9)	10(9.3)	24(43.6)	N/A	25(31.6)	9(23.7)
Additional objectives						
49. Social studies	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(1.8)	N/A	9(11.4)	3(7.9)
50. Science, health, grooming	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(1.8)	N/A	9(11.4)	1(2.6)
51. Visual discrimination	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(1.8)	N/A	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
Social/behavioral objectives						
52. Improve self concept	1(2.9)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	N/A	21(26.6)	10(26.3)
53. Assertiveness skills	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	N/A	3(3.8)	4(10.5)
54. Responsible behavior	1(2.9)	5(4.6)	0(0.0)	N/A	12(15.2)	7(18.4)
55. Appropriate social interaction	1(2.9)	6(5.6)	0(0.0)	N/A	18(22.8)	5(13.2)
56. Social communication skills	2(5.9)	6(5.6)	6(10.9)	N/A	22(27.8)	9(23.7)

While data suggest that the most frequently listed objectives were similar across districts, there were differences in the types of objectives set across districts. For example, in the area of oral expression, IEPs from Districts 1 and 2 contained objectives such as "speaking in complete sentences" and "relating events in sequence". No IEP in District 3 contained either of these objectives. Conversely, IEPs from District 3 included a number of social/behavioral objectives, while almost no IEPs from District 1 or 2 involved objectives of this type. These findings suggest that in addition to being determined by the characteristics of the child for whom it is written, the contents of an IEP may be influenced both by a district's formal curriculum and by its informal expectations for students.

A second difference among districts was the average number of objectives written within categories. For example, Table 5 shows that the highest average number of objectives for LEP students for any category was 3.3 for District 1, while the highest average for District 2 was 7.9. This large difference makes comparison of objectives across districts difficult, in that one objective from District 1 may represent a much greater amount of intended instructional time than one objective from District 2. It is likely, however, that the greater number of objectives in District 2 are a result of the ease with which ARD committees could add an objective to an IEP (i.e., by simply circling it on an already prepared list rather than writing it "from scratch"). Future research might consider the influence of ease of objective writing on the composition of children's IEPs, as well as the effects of the number of objectives on special education instruction and student outcomes.

Differences in Educational Goals for LD LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Children

Tables 7 and 8 summarize the goals which were most frequently set and the goals with highest priority rankings for LD LEP and non-LEP children within each district. Data show that the goals for the two groups were similar both within and across districts. Reading was the most frequently set goal in all districts, and was either the highest ranked or second-highest ranked goal for both LEPs and non-LEPs in Districts 1 and 2. In Districts 1 and 3, where within-district comparison of goals for LD LEPs and non-LEPs was possible, the most frequently set goals and their priority rankings were nearly identical across groups. The goals which were most frequently listed and which were ranked highest were also very similar for LEPs across districts, with the most frequently targeted areas including reading, language arts areas such as written expression and spelling, math, and oral expression.

Tables 9 and 10 summarize the categories of objectives which were most frequently used and the mean number of objectives per category. The categories of objectives used were fairly consistent for LEPs and non-LEPs both within and across districts. The majority of children had objectives which were consistent with their highest priority goals of reading and language arts, including objectives in areas such as passage comprehension, word recognition, and word attack skills. The most frequently used objectives for LEPs in Districts 2 and 3 seemed to be slightly more language-oriented than the most frequently used objectives in District 1. This may again represent differences in curriculum emphases across districts. The mean number of objectives per category

Table 7

Five Most Frequently Listed IEP Goals for
Learning Disabled LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students

District	Group	
	LEP	Non-LEP
	(n=34)	(n=108)
1	1. Reading (85%)[a] 2. Written expression (71%) 3. Spelling (38%) 4. Math (24%) 6. Oral expression (15%) 6. Receptive language (15%) 6. Speech (15%)	1. Reading (85%) 2. Written expression (64%) 3. Spelling (49%) 4. Math (27%) 5. Oral expression (21%)
	(n=55)	
2	1. Reading (86%) 2. Oral expression (66%) 3. Math (53%) 4. Language arts (16%) 5. Speech (14%)	None available from this district
	(n=79)	(n=38)
3	1. Reading (90%) 2. Written expression (84%) 3.5. Reading comprehension (82%) 3.5 Spelling (82%) 5. Math calculation (71%)	1. Reading (87%) 2. Spelling (84%) 3. Reading comprehension (82%) 4. Math calculation (74%) 5. Written expression (71%)

Note. Goals are listed in rank order.
[a]Percentage of group for whom this goal was listed.

Table 8

IEP Goals for LD LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students With the Five Highest Mean Priority Rankings in Rank Order by District[a]

District	Group	
	LEP	Non-LEP
	(n=34)	(n=108)
1	1.5. Reading, non-specific (1.0)[b] 1.5. Reading comprehension (1.0) 3. Written expression (2.2) 4.5. Math, non-specific (2.4) 4.5. Spelling skills (2.4)	1.5. Reading, non-specific (1.2) 1.5. Reading comprehension (1.2) 3. Spelling skills (2.1) 4.5. Language arts (2.2) 4.5. Written expression (2.2)
	(n=55)	
2	1. Receptive language[c] (1.0) 2. Reading, non-specific (1.2) 3. Spelling (1.4) 4. Speech (1.6) 5. Oral expression (1.7)	None available for this district

Note. A rank of 1 indicates highest priority.
[a]Priority rankings were not available for District 3.
[b]( ) = Average priority ranking.
[c]This goal was listed for only 1 child.

Table 9

Most Frequently Listed Objectives for Learning Disabled LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students in Rank Order by District (First 10 Objectives)

District	Group: LEP	Group: Non-LEP
	(n=34)	(n=108)
1	1. Passage comprehension (59%)[a] 2. Word attack (56%) 3. Word recognition (53%) 4. Spelling (general) (47%) 5. Capitalization/punctuation (41%) 6. Improve oral reading (38%) 8. Use phonics skills in spelling (27%) 8. Handwriting/printing (27%) 8. Sentence writing (27%) 11. Addition and subtraction (24%) 11. Written grammar and syntax (24%) 11. Pronunciation/articulation/ auditory discrimination (24%)	1. Word recognition (73%) 2. Spelling (general) (49%) 3. Capitalization/punctuation (47%) 4. Passage comprehension (45%) 5.5. Word attack (37%) 5.5. Sentence writing (37%) 7. Improve oral reading (32%) 8. Reading, non-specific (29%) 9. Handwriting/printing (27%)
	(n=55)	
2	1. Word attack skills (75%) 2. Passage comprehension (67%) 3. Oral grammar and syntax (60%) 4. Word recognition (58%) 5. Reference skills (53%) 6. Pronunciation/articulation/ auditory discrimination (51%) 7.5. Capitalization/punctuation (49%) 7.5. Temporal knowledge (49%) 10.5. Precomputation math (46%) 10.5. Reading readiness (46%) 10.5. Expressive language (46%) 10.5. Increase spoken vocabulary (46%)	None available for this district
	(n=79)	(n=38)
3	1. Word recognition (90%) 2. Word attack (76%) 3. Use phonics skills in spelling (73%) 4. Spelling (general) (72%) 5. Reasoning skills (math) (68%) 7. Addition and subtraction (66%) 7. Capitalization/punctuation (66%) 7. Sentence writing (66%) 9. Passage comprehension (63%) 10.5. Increase spoken vocabulary (62%) 10.5. Oral grammar and syntax (62%)	1. Word recognition (85%) 2. Use phonics skills in spelling (82%) 3. Word attack (79%) 4.5. Passage comprehension (74%) 4.5. Spelling (general) (74%) 6. Addition and subtraction (71%) 7.5. Capitalization/punctuation (66%) 7.5. Sentence writing (66%) 9. Reasoning skills (math) (63%) 10. Handwriting or printing (42%)

[a] ( ) = Percentage of group for whom this objective was listed.

Table 10

Categories For Which the Greatest Numbers of Objectives Were Written for LD LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students in Rank Order by District[a]
(First 10 Objectives)

District	Group: LEP	Group: Non-LEP
	(n=34)	(n=108)
1	1. Reading readiness (3.3)[b]	1. Responsible behavior (4.6)
	3. General coordination (3.0)	2. Fine motor skills (3.8)
	3. Social communication (3.0)	3. General coordination (2.8)
	3. Reference skills (3.0)	4. Expressive language (2.7)
	5. Written grammar and syntax (2.5)	5. Oral grammar and syntax (2.5)
	6.5. Oral grammar and syntax (2.3)	6. Word attack skills (2.4)
	6.5. Pronunciation, articulation (2.3)	7.5. Word recognition (2.2)
	8. Handwriting or printing (2.2)	7.5. Pronunciation, articulation (2.2)
	10. Improve voice (2.0)	9.5. Multiply and divide (2.1)
	10. Listening skills (2.0)	9.5. General spelling (2.1)
	10. Responsible behavior (2.0)	
	(n=55)	
2	1. Word attack skills (7.9)	None available for this district
	2. Categorization/similarities (7.4)	
	3. Precomputation math (6.8)	
	4. Oral grammar and syntax (6.7)	
	5. Written grammar and syntax (6.3)	
	6. Passage comprehension (5.5)	
	7. Reading readiness (5.1)	
	8. Fine motor skills (5.0)	
	9. Addition and subtraction (4.9)	
	10. Pronunciation, articulation (4.0)	

[a] Averages were not available for District 3.
[b] ( ) = Average number of objectives for this category.

differed across districts, but appeared similar for LEPs and non-LEPs in District 1 (the only district where this comparison was possible).

Most Frequently Targeted Areas for MR LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Children

The same indicators of IEP priority areas which were previously described, were calculated for mentally retarded children. Table 11 shows the average priority ranking for each goal for LEP and non-LEP children in Districts 1 and 2; Table 12 shows the number and percentage of children for whom each goal was set in Districts 1, 2 and 3. Data for Districts 1 and 2 show that while the highest priority rankings were given to reading goals, the most frequently set goals fell into the area of oral expression/language. Social or behavioral and motor skills goals were also set for the majority of children in District 1, while math and reading were set as goals for the majority of children in District 2. In District 3, the most frequently set goals included language, social/behavioral skills, and academic areas. It appears that although all of these districts gave priority to developing the academic skills of mentally retarded students, it was also necessary to develop more basic language and social skills.

As with the LD sample, some differences in target areas which may have reflected district curriculum or districts' informal expectations for their students were apparent in goals set for mentally retarded students. For example, Districts 1 and 3 appeared to place more emphasis on social/behavioral goals than did District 2.

Table 13 shows the mean number of objectives in each category for MR children in Districts 1 and 2; Table 14 shows the number and percentage of children from all three districts who had at least one objective in each category. Data suggest that language and readiness skills were the areas for which objectives were most frequently written.

Differences in Educational Goals for MR LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Children

Tables 15 and 16 summarize the goals which were most frequently set by all three districts and the average priority rankings for goals for LEP and non-LEP mentally retarded children in Districts 1 and 2. Both the small number of mentally retarded students available within the three districts and the distribution of LEPs and non-LEPs across districts make comparison of the two groups difficult. However, goals for LEPs and non-LEPs appeared to be similar. In both Districts 1 and 2, highest priority was given to academic goals (mainly reading and language arts) and in both of these districts, oral expression/expressive language was the most frequently used goal for both LEPs and non-LEPs. For District 3, the most frequently used goals (which were nearly identical for both groups) included math, reading, oral expression and social/behavioral skills.

Tables 17 and 18 summarize the most frequently used categories of objectives for LEPs and non-LEPs across the three districts, and the average number of objectives within each category for both groups in Districts 1 and 2. The majority of both LEPs and non-LEPs in all districts had objectives which addressed language, motor skills and readiness level academics. With the exception of LEPs in District 2, the majority of children in both groups also had at least one

Table 11

Mean Priority of Rankings of IEP Goals for LEP and Non-LEP Mentally Retarded Students by District[a]

	District							
	1				2			
	LEP (n=0)		Non-LEP (n=34)		LEP (n=27)		Non-LEP (n=5)	
IEP goals	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1. Math, non-specific	N/A[b]		2.4	0.9(14)[c]	2.7	0.6(18)	3.0	0.0(2)
2. Math calculation	N/A		----------[d]		----------		----------	
3. Math reasoning	N/A		----------		----------		----------	
4. Reading, non-specific	N/A		1.8	0.8(10)	1.6	0.6(18)	2.0	0.0(2)
5. Reading comprehension	N/A		1.5	0.7(2)	----------		----------	
6. Language Arts	N/A		5.0	2.8(2)	1.3	0.5(6)	1.0	0.0(1)
7. Spelling skills	N/A		4.0	0.0(1)	4.0	0.0(1)	----------	
8. Written expression	N/A		2.3	1.2(6)	1.0	0.0(3)	----------	
9. Oral expression or language	N/A		1.9	1.1(27)	1.3	0.6(18)	1.0	0.0(4)
10. Receptive language	N/A		2.3	1.2(7)	1.0	0.0(1)	----------	
11. Social studies	N/A		----------		4.5	0.7(2)	----------	
12. Science/health	N/A		4.0	0.0(1)	4.0	0.0(1)	----------	
13. Social/behavioral	N/A		3.4	1.7(19)	----------		2.7	1.2(3)
14. Speech	N/A		3.2	1.5(4)	2.0	1.0(3)	2.0	0.0(1)
15. Motor skills, non-specific	N/A		3.2	1.5(13)	----------		2.0	0.0(1)
16. Fine or visual motor	N/A		3.4	1.3(18)	----------		1.0	0.0(1)
17. Gross motor skills	N/A		3.0	1.2(18)	----------		----------	
18. Self-help	N/A		3.5	1.2(13)	----------		3.0	0.0(2)
19. Readiness skills	N/A		1.7	0.6(3)	----------		3.0	0.0(1)
20. Vocational skills	N/A		----------		----------		----------	
21. Study skills	N/A		----------		----------		----------	

Note. A ranking of 1 indicates highest priority.
[a]Priority rankings were not available for District 3.
[b]N/A = No children were available for this group in this district.
[c]( ) = Number of children with a priority ranking for goal.
[d]No child's IEP contained this goal.

Table 12

Number and Percentage of LEP and Non-LEP Mentally Retarded Students Whose IEPs Listed Each of 21 Goals by District

IEP goals	District 1 LEP (n=0) # (%)	District 1 Non-LEP (n=34) # (%)	District 2 LEP (n=27) # (%)	District 2 Non-LEP (n=5) # (%)	District 3 LEP (n=8) # (%)	District 3 Non-LEP (n=8) # (%)
1. Math, non-specific	N/A[a]	14(41.2)	21(77.8)	2(40.0)	--------[b]	--------
2. Math calculation	N/A	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	8(100.0)	8(100.0)
3. Math reasoning	N/A	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	8(100.0)	4(50.0)
4. Reading, non-specific	N/A	10(29.4)	21(77.8)	2(40.0)	8(100.0)	8(100.0)
5. Reading comprehension	N/A	2(5.9)	1(3.7)	0(0.0)	2(25.0)	1(12.5)
6. Language Arts	N/A	2(5.9)	7(25.9)	1(20.0)	--------	--------
7. Spelling skills	N/A	1(2.9)	1(3.7)	0(0.0)	4(50.0)	1(12.5)
8. Written expression	N/A	6(17.6)	3(11.1)	0(0.0)	8(100.0)	7(87.5)
9. Oral expression or language	N/A	27(79.4)	23(85.2)	4(80.0)	8(100.0)	7(87.5)
10. Receptive language	N/A	7(20.6)	1(3.7)	0(0.0)	7(87.5)	8(100.0)
11. Social studies	N/A	0(0.0)	2(7.4)	0(0.0)	2(25.0)	1(12.5)
12. Science/health	N/A	1(2.9)	1(3.7)	0(0.0)	4(50.0)	5(62.5)
13. Social/behavioral	N/A	19(55.9)	0(0.0)	3(60.0)	8(100.0)	8(100.0)
14. Speech	N/A	4(11.8)	4(14.8)	1(20.0)	2(25.0)	3(37.5)
15. Motor skills, non-specific	N/A	13(38.2)	0(0.0)	2(40.0)	--------	--------
16. Fine or visual motor	N/A	18(52.9)	0(0.0)	1(20.0)	4(50.0)	5(62.5)
17. Gross motor skills	N/A	18(52.9)	0(0.0)	1(20.0)	4(50.0)	5(62.5)
18. Self-help	N/A	13(38.2)	0(0.0)	2(40.0)	4(50.0)	5(62.5)
19. Readiness skills	N/A	3(8.8)	0(0.0)	1(20.0)	--------	--------
20. Vocational skills	N/A	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	3(37.5)	3(37.5)
21. Study skills	N/A	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	3(37.5)	2(25.0)

[a]N/A = No children were available for this group in this district.
[b]Goal not used by this district.

Table 13

Mean Number of IEP Objectives by Category for Mentally Retarded LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students by District[a]

	District							
	1				2			
	LEP (n=0)		Non-LEP (n=34)		LEP (n=27)		Non-LEP (n=5)	
IEP objectives	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Math objectives								
1. Non-specific	N/A[b]		1.6	0.5(7)[c]	1.0	0.0(2)	1.0	0.0(1)
2. Calculations non-specific	N/A		----------[d]		----------		----------	
3. Pre-computation	N/A		2.8	2.4(14)	5.6	3.8(17)	20.0	0.0(1)
4. Add/subtract	N/A		3.8	2.2(10)	4.9	3.6(13)	18.0	0.0(1)
5. Multiply/divide	N/A		1.0	0.0(2)	4.0	0.0(1)	6.0	0.0(1)
6. Fractions/decimals	N/A		----------		2.2	1.6(5)	5.0	0.0(1)
7. Reasoning/word problems	N/A		----------		5.4	3.2(5)	19.0	0.0(1)
8. Consumer applications	N/A		2.0	1.4(2)	1.5	0.6(6)	3.0	0.0(1)
Reading objectives								
9. Non-specific	N/A		1.3	0.6(3)	2.0	0.0(1)	----------	
10. Reading readiness	N/A		3.4	3.5(7)	----------		5.8	6.5(12)
11. Word recognition; reading vocabulary	N/A		2.7	1.8(17)	2.2	1.4(10)	5.5	2.1(2)
12. Word attack skills	N/A		1.8	1.2(8)	5.9	3.8(11)	31.0	0.0(1)
13. Improve reading rate	N/A		1.0	0.0(1)	----------		----------	
14. Improve oral reading	N/A		2.0	0.0(2)	1.0	0.0(2)	----------	
15. Passage comprehension	N/A		2.0	0.0(1)	3.2	5.5(6)	17.0	0.0(1)
16. Reference skills	N/A		----------		4.7	4.2(6)	7.0	0.0(1)
Spelling objectives								
17. General spelling	N/A		1.5	0.7(2)	----------		1.0	0.0(1)
18. Phonics skills	N/A		1.5	0.7(2)	----------		----------	

[a]Objectives were not available for District 3.
[b]N/A = No children were available for this group in this district.
[c]( ) = Number of children whose IEPs contained objectives in this category.
[d]No child's IEP contained this goal.

Table 13 (continued)

IEP objectives	District 1 LEP (n=0) M	SD	1 Non-LEP (n=34) M	SD	2 LEP (n=27) M	SD	2 Non-LEP (n=5) M	SD
Writing objectives								
19. Written expression	N/A		1.0	0.0(5)	----------		----------	
20. Handwriting or printing	N/A		1.9	0.8(14)	2.0	0.0(1)	3.5	0.7(2)
21. Write personal data	N/A		2.0	1.1(9)	----------		----------	
22. Capitalization; punctuation	N/A		1.0	0.0(1)	3.0	2.2(4)	7.0	0.0 (1)
23. Sentence writing	N/A		2.0	0.0(1)	1.0	0.0(2)	2.0	0.0(1)
24. Paragraph writing	N/A		----------		----------		2.0	0.0(1)
25. Written grammar and syntax	N/A		1.5	0.6(4)	----------		----------	
Oral expression and speech								
26. Expressive language/ language development	N/A		4.0	2.7(23)	1.9	1.2(17)	4.7	2.5(3)
27. Pronunciation, articulation, auditory discrimination	N/A		2.3	2.3(14)	3.9	3.0(17)	4.5	3.5(2)
28. Increase spoken or oral vocabulary	N/A		1.0	0.0(2)	1.7	0.9(14)	5.0	0.0(1)
29. Oral grammar and syntax	N/A		2.1	1.5(21)	7.1	5.7(18)	11.5	2.1(2)
30. Speak in complete sentences	N/A		2.0	1.7(3)	2.5	0.9(9)	1.5	0.7(2)
31. Relate story or events in sequence	N/A		1.3	0.5(4)	1.0	0.0(6)	2.0	0.0(1)
32. Improve voice	N/A		1.0	0.0(1)	1.3	0.5(7)	----------	
33. Improve fluency	N/A		1.0	0.0(3)	1.3	0.9(12)	1.5	0.7(2)
Receptive language/ listening comprehension								
34. Improve listening skill	N/A		2.0	1.4(4)	1.5	0.7(12)	2.3	2.3(3)
35. Improve memory	N/A		1.2	0.5(5)	2.0	1.0(5)	1.0	0.0(1)
Motor development								
36. Fine motor skills	N/A		4.8	2.9(22)	3.6	3.4(5)	5.0	4.4(3)
37. General coordination	N/A		4.0	2.8(21)	----------		4.0	2.8(2)
38. Gross motor	N/A		2.8	1.9(18)	6.0	0.0(1)	1.0	0.0(1)

Table 13 (continued)

IEP objectives	District 1 LEP (n=0) M	SD	1 Non-LEP (n=34) M	SD	2 LEP (n=27) M	SD	2 Non-LEP (n=5) M	SD
Self-help objectives								
39. Dressing skills	N/A		2.1	1.5(9)	3.0	0.0(1)	1.0	0.0(1)
40. Eating and feeding	N/A		2.1	0.7(7)	9.0	0.0(1)	1.5	0.7(2)
41. Toileting	N/A		1.5	0.8(8)	----------		5.5	2.1(2)
General readiness								
42. Sequencing ideas/events	N/A		1.0	0.0(1)	1.9	1.1(8)	1.0	0.0(1)
43. Color recognition	N/A		1.6	0.7(8)	1.0	0.0(1)	----------	
44. Body awareness	N/A		2.2	1.5(12)	1.4	0.5(7)	2.0	1.4(2)
45. Directional/ positional skills	N/A		1.5	0.7(13)	2.6	1.7(12)	2.0	1.4(2)
46. Recite personal data	N/A		1.8	0.9(12)	1.3	0.5(6)	3.0	0.0(1)
47. Temporal knowledge	N/A		1.8	1.0(4)	2.9	2.1(13)	3.0	0.0(2)
48. Categorization/ similarities	N/A		3.0	1.7(20)	8.7	5.7(14)	6.0	6.3(3)
Additional objectives								
49. Social studies	N/A		----------		3.0	0.0(1)	----------	
50. Science, health, grooming	N/A		----------		1.0	0.0(1)	----------	
51. Visual discrimination	N/A		----------		----------		----------	
Social/behavioral objectives								
52. Improve self concept	N/A		2.0	0.0(2)	----------		----------	
53. Assertiveness skills	N/A		----------		----------		----------	
54. Responsible behavior	N/A		2.2	1.3(17)	----------		7.0	1.4(2)
55. Appropriate social interaction	N/A		3.0	1.8(11)	2.0	0.0(1)	2.7	2.1(3)
56. Social communication skills	N/A		1.8	0.4(6)	1.3	0.3(4)	----------	

Table 14

Number and Percentage of Mentally Retarded LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students Whose IEPs Contained Objectives in Each of 56 Categories

	District					
	1		2		3	
	LEP (n=0)	Non-LEP (n=34)	LEP (n=27)	Non-LEP (n=5)	LEP (n=8)	Non-LEP (n=8)
IEP objectives	# (%)	# (%)	# (%)	# (%)	# (%)	# (%)
Math objectives						
1. Non-specific	N/A[a]	8(23.5)	2(7.4)	1(20.0)	1(12.5)	0(0.0)
2. Calculations, non-specific	N/A	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(12.5)	0(0.0)
3. Pre-computation	N/A	16(47.1)	20(74.1)	1(20.0)	5(62.5)	7(87.5)
4. Add/subtract	N/A	12(35.3)	15(55.6)	1(20.0)	5(62.5)	1(12.5)
5. Multiply/divide	N/A	2(5.9)	1(3.7)	1(20.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
6. Fractions/decimals	N/A	0(0.0)	5(18.5)	1(20.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
7. Reasoning/word problems	N/A	0(0.0)	5(18.5)	1(20.0)	1(12.5)	6(75.0)
8. Consumer applications	N/A	3(8.8)	8(29.6)	1(20.0)	2(25.0)	6(75.0)
Reading objectives						
9. Non-specific	N/A	3(8.8)	1(3.7)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
10. Reading readiness	N/A	7(20.6)	13(48.1)	0(0.0)	6(75.0)	7(87.5)
11. Word recognition; reading vocabulary	N/A	19(55.9)	13(48.1)	2(40.0)	7(87.5)	5(62.5)
12. Word attack skills	N/A	9(26.5)	14(51.9)	1(20.0)	5(62.5)	2(25.0)
13. Improve reading rate	N/A	1(2.9)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	2(25.0)	1(12.5)
14. Improve oral reading	N/A	3(8.8)	2(7.4)	0(0.0)	1(12.5)	0(0.0)
15. Passage comprehension	N/A	3(8.8)	7(25.9)	1(20.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
16. Reference skills	N/A	0(0.0)	9(33.3)	1(20.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
Spelling objectives						
17. General spelling	N/A	2(5.9)	2(7.4)	1(20.0)	4(50.0)	1(12.5)
18. Phonics skills	N/A	3(8.8)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(50.0)	1(12.5)

[a]N/A = No children were available for this group in this district.

Table 14 (continued)

IEP objectives	District 1 LEP (n=0) # (%)	1 Non-LEP (n=34) # (%)	2 LEP (n=27) # (%)	2 Non-LEP (n=5) # (%)	3 LEP (n=8) # (%)	3 Non-LEP (n=8) # (%)
Writing objectives						
19. Written expression	N/A	5(14.7)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
20. Handwriting or printing	N/A	15(44.1)	2(7.4)	2(40.0)	8(100.0)	7(87.5)
21. Write personal data	N/A	9(26.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	5(62.5)	6(75.0)
22. Capitalization; punctuation	N/A	1(2.9)	6(22.2)	1(20.0)	3(37.5)	1(12.5)
23. Sentence writing	N/A	1(2.9)	2(7.4)	1(20.0)	2(25.0)	0(0.0)
24. Paragraph writing	N/A	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(20.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
25. Written grammar and syntax	N/A	4(11.8)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
Oral expression and speech						
26. Expressive language/ language development	N/A	25(73.5)	20(74.1)	4(80.0)	5(62.5)	5(62.5)
27. Pronunciation, articulation, audicory discrimination	N/A	15(44.1)	20(74.1)	2(40.0)	5(62.5)	8(100.0)
28. Increase spoken or oral vocabulary	N/A	2(5.9)	15(55.6)	2(40.0)	8(100.0)	7(87.5)
29. Oral grammar and syntax	N/A	22(64.7)	20(74.1)	2(40.0)	8(100.0)	7(87.5)
30. Speak in complete sentences	N/A	4(11.8)	10(37.0)	2(40.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
31. Relate story or events in sequence	N/A	5(14.7)	7(25.9)	1(20.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
32. Improve voice	N/A	2(5.9)	8(29.6)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
33. Improve fluency	N/A	3(8.8)	14(51.9)	2(40.0)	2(25.0)	2(25.0)
Receptive language/ listening comprehension						
34. Improve listening skill	N/A	6(17.6)	13(48.1)	4(80.0)	7(87.5)	8(100.0)
35. Improve memory	N/A	7(20.6)	6(22.2)	2(40.0)	7(87.5)	8(100.0)
Motor development						
36. Fine motor skills	N/A	23(67.6)	0(0.0)	4(80.0)	4(50.0)	5(62.5)
37. General coordination	N/A	22(64.7)	0(0.0)	2(40.0)	4(50.0)	5(62.5)
38. Gross motor	N/A	19(55.9)	1(3.7)	2(40.0)	4(50.0)	4(50.0)

Table 14 (continued)

IEP objectives	District 1 LEP (n=0) # (%)	District 1 Non-LEP (n=34) # (%)	District 2 LEP (n=27) # (%)	District 2 Non-LEP (n=5) # (%)	District 3 LEP (n=8) # (%)	District 3 Non-LEP (n=8) # (%)
Self-help objectives						
39. Dressing skills	N/A	10(29.4)	1(3.7)	1(20.0)	2(25.0)	4(50.0)
40. Eating and feeding	N/A	7(20.6)	1(3.7)	2(40.0)	2(25.0)	4(50.0)
41. Toileting	N/A	8(23.5)	0(0.0)	2(40.0)	2(25.0)	1(12.5)
General readiness						
42. Sequencing ideas/events	N/A	1(2.9)	9(33.3)	1(20.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
43. Color recognition	N/A	8(23.5)	1(3.7)	0(0.0)	1(12.5)	0(0.0)
44. Body awareness	N/A	12(35.3)	7(25.9)	2(40.0)	2(25.0)	3(37.5)
45. Directional/ positional skills	N/A	14(41.2)	13(48.1)	3(60.0)	4(50.0)	2(25.0)
46. Recite personal data	N/A	13(38.2)	7(25.9)	2(40.0)	4(50.0)	3(37.5)
47. Temporal knowledge	N/A	5(14.7)	16(59.3)	2(40.0)	4(50.0)	1(12.5)
48. Categorization/ similarities	N/A	21(61.8)	16(59.3)	4(80.0)	5(62.5)	6(75.0)
Additional objectiaves						
49. Social studies	N/A	0(0.0)	1(3.7)	0(0.0)	2(25.0)	1(12.5)
50. Science, health, grooming	N/A	0(0.0)	1(3.7)	0(0.0)	5(62.5)	5(62.5)
51. Visual discrimination	N/A	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(20.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
Social/behavioral objectives						
52. Improve self concept	N/A	2(5.9)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	6(75.0)	4(50.0)
53. Assertiveness skills	N/A	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(20.0)	3(37.5)	1(12.5)
54. Responsible behavior	N/A	18(52.9)	0(0.0)	3(60.0)	7(87.5)	8(100.0)
55. Appropriate social interaction	N/A	12(35.3)	1(3.7)	4(80.0)	6(75.0)	8(100.0)
56. Social communication skills	N/A	7(20.6)	4(14.8)	0(0.0)	7(87.5)	7(87.5)

Table 15

Five Most Frequently Listed IEP Goals for
Mentally Retarded LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students

District	Group: LEP	Group: Non-LEP
		(n=34)
1	None available for this district	1. Oral expression or language (79%)[a] 2. Social/behavioral (56%) 3.5. Fine or visual motor skills (53%) 3.5. Gross motor skills (53%) 5. Math (41%)
	(n=27)	(n=5)
2	1. Oral expression or language (85%) 2.5. Math (78%) 2.5. Reading (78%) 4. Language Arts (26%) 5. Speech (15%)	1. Oral expression or language (80%) 2. Social/behavioral (60%)
	(n=8)	(n=8)
3	3.5. Math calculation (100%) 3.5. Math reasoning (100%) 3.5. Reading (100%) 3.5. Written expression (100%) 3.5. Oral expression or language (100%) 3.5. Social/behavioral (100%)	2.5. Math calculation (100%) 2.5. Reading (100%) 2.5. Receptive language (100%) 2.5. Social/behavioral (100%) 5.5. Written expression (88%) 5.5. Oral expression or language (88%)

Note. Goals are listed in rank order.
[a]( ) = Percentage of group for whom this goal was listed.

Table 16

IEP Goals for MR LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students With the Five Highest Mean Priority Rankings in Rank Order by District[a]

District	Group: LEP	Group: Non-LEP
1	None available for this district	(n=34) 1. Reading comprehension (1.5)[b] 2. Readiness skills (1.7) 3. Reading, non-specific (1.8) 4. Oral expression (1.9) 5.5. Written expression (2.3) 5.5. Receptive language (2.3)
2	(n=27) 1.5. Written expression (1.0) 1.5. Receptive language (1.0) 3.5. Language arts (1.3) 3.5. Oral expression (1.3) 5. Reading, non-specific (1.6)	(n=5) 2. Language arts (1.0) 2. Oral expression (1.0) 2. Fine or visual motor skills (1.0) 5. Reading, non-specific (2.0) 5. Speech (2.0) 5. Motor skills (2.0)

Note. A rank of 1 indicates highest priority.
[a]Priority rankings were not available for District 3.
[b]( ) = Average priority ranking.

Table 17

Most Frequently Listed Objectives for Mentally Retarded LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students in Rank Order by District (First 10 Objectives)

District	Group: LEP	Group: Non-LEP
1	None available for this district	(n=34) 1. Expressive language (74%)[a] 2. Fine motor skills (68%) 3.5. Oral grammar and syntax (65%) 3.5. General coordination (65%) 5. Categorization skills (62%) 6.5. Word recognition skills (56%) 6.5. Gross motor skills (56%) 8. Increase responsible behavior (53%) 9. Pre-computation math (47%) 10.5. Handwriting or printing (44%) 10.5. Pronunciation/articulation/ auditory discrimination (44%)
2	(n=27) 2.5. Pre-computation math (74%) 2.5. Expressive language (74%) 2.5. Pronunciation/articulation/ auditory discrimination (74%) 2.5. Oral grammar and syntax (74%) 5.5. Knowledge of time (59%) 5.5. Categorization skills (59%) 7.5. Addition and subtraction (56%) 7.5. Increase oral vocabulary (56%) 9.5. Word attack skills (52%) 9.5. Improve oral fluency (52%)	(n=5) 3. Expressive language (80%) 3. Listening skills (80%) 3. Fine motor skills (80%) 3. Categorization skills (80%) 3. Appropriate social interaction (80%)
3	(n=8) 2. Handwriting or printing (100%) 2. Increase oral vocabulary (100%) 2. Oral grammar and syntax (100%) 6. Word recognition (88%) 6. Listening skills (88%) 6. Memory/attention (88%) 6. Increase responsible behavior (38%) 6. Social communication skills (88%) 10. Reading readiness (75%) 10. Improve self concept (75%) 10. Appropriate social interaction (75%)	(n=8) 3. Listening skills (100%) 3. Memory/attention (100%) 3. Pronunciation/articulation/ auditory discrimination (100%) 3. Increase responsible behavior (100%) 3. Appropriate social interaction (100%) 8.5. Precomputation math (88%) 8.5. Reading readiness (88%) 8.5. Handwriting or printing (88%) 8.5. Increase oral vocabulary (88%) 8.5. Oral grammar and syntax (88%) 8.5. Social communication skills (88%)

[a] ( ) = Percentage of group for whom this objective was listed.

Table 18

Categories For Which the Greatest Numbers of Objectives Were Written for MR LEP and Non-LEP Hispanic Students in Rank Order by District[a] (First 10 Objectives)

District	Group	
	LEP	Non-LEP
		(n=34)
1	None available for this district	1. Fine motor skills (4.8)[b] 2.5. General coordination (4.0) 2.5. Expressive language (4.0) 4. Addition or subtraction (3.8) 5. Reading readiness (3.4) 6.5. Categorization (3.0) 6.5. Appropriate social interaction (3.0) 8.5. Pre-computation math (2.8) 8.5. Gross motor skills (2.8) 10. Word recognition (2.7)
	(n=27)	(n=5)
2	1. Eating and feeding (9.0)[c] 2. Categorization (8.7) 3. Oral grammar and syntax (7.1) 4. Gross motor skills (6.0)[c] 5. Word attack skills (5.9) 6. Pre-computation math (5.6) 7. Math reasoning; word problems (5.4) 8. Passage comprehension (5.2) 9. Addition or subtraction (4.9) 10. Reference skills (4.7)	Not tallied due to low n.

[a] Averages were not available for District 3.
[b] ( ) = Average number of objectives in this category.
[c] Objectives were listed in this category for only one child.

social/behavioral objective.

Use of Spanish as the Language of Instruction for Handicapped Hispanic Students

None of the IEP forms used by any of the districts provided any space or direction to specify the language of instruction for goals or objectives. Consequently, few references to language of instruction were found. While this is not surprising, it raises serious questions about the effectiveness of instruction delivered in English when students are identified as limited English proficient.

Eight of the 396 IEPs (2%) examined stated that some instruction would be carried out in Spanish. In seven cases, the objectives to be carried out in Spanish were not specified; in the eighth, it was stated that the child would work on social communication skills with a "communication technician." Two of these IEPs had been written for students whose primary handicap was MR; the other six were for children whose primary handicap was LD. In two districts, none of the children whose IEPs mentioned Spanish instruction had been classified as LEP; in the third, all children who were to receive at least some special education instruction in Spanish were so classified. In the few cases where language of instruction was considered, practices for use of Spanish as the language of special education instruction appeared to differ across districts.

Implications of IEP Findings for the Longitudinal Intervention Study

Findings from this examination of IEPs for LEP and non-LEP students suggest several things that may be important to consider in the upcoming years of the HMRI's longitudinal intervention study. First, it would appear that modules will be most useful to teachers if they focus on strategies which can be used in the teaching of reading and language. The IEP data suggest that these are the most frequent target areas for special education instruction for both LEP and non-LEP Hispanic children, and that strategies suitable to these areas might be used with both LD and MR children. The collaborative process planned for Year 2 of the study might include confirming these perceptions with selected teachers. It might also be useful to discuss with these teachers how the goals and objectives set in the IEP are used to guide the delivery of instruction, so that the usefulness of the results presented here in module planning can be further determined.

Additionally, data gathered from IEPs confirm the perception gained from the pilot classroom observations that the language of special education instruction is not a dimension which is routinely considered by special education personnel. Should further observation and the collaborative process reconfirm this finding, it will be important for the modules to incorporate information which will introduce teachers to the idea of considering the language of instruction and information which will train them to make decisions about the language of instruction that can be both used in the classroom and made a part of children's IEPs.

Implications for Policy, Practice and Research

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, P.L. 94-142, mandates that local education agencies (LEAs) provide appropriate educational opportunities for all handicapped children, regardless of the severity of their handicap. To identify children's needs, a multidisciplinary assessment is conducted, using instruments believed to be free of linguistic, cultural, racial, or other bias, and the resulting data are used to develop a written individualized education program (IEP) for those students who are eligible for special education services. The IEP details goals and objectives for the student's educational program, recommends instructional activities, materials, and approaches, and delineates criteria for evaluating progress toward attainment of specified goals.

The development of IEPs for students who qualify for both special education and for special language programs (e.g., bilingual education or English as a second language) has received minimal consideration in special education literature. It is not surprising, then, that the major finding of this study was that there is little difference in the goals and objectives included in the IEPs of limited English proficient (LEP) Hispanic students versus those specified for English proficient (non-LEP) Hispanic students, or that a child's English language proficiency has little effect on the recommendations of IEP committees charged with developing instructional programs. Instructional recommendations, with very few exceptions, assumed that the handicapped LEP child would profit from instruction delivered totally in English.

Native Language Assessment

Development of IEPs is guided by a summary of assessment results and a description of a student's present level of performance. It is possible that the lack of native language assessment as part of the individualized comprehensive assessment precludes selection of native language-related goals and objectives in design of IEPs for LEPs. In a study of 334 LEP Hispanic students in LD programs, Ortiz et. al. (1985) found that very few students were tested in Spanish or bilingually, even when the student was Spanish dominant and/or receiving instruction in bilingual education programs. Current practice results in significant gaps in the data required, both to determine special education eligibility, and to develop sound instructional programs. State policy should specify minimum assessment data which must be provided to assure that the child's problems are not related to a lack of English proficiency, to verify LEP status, and to support decisions related to the language of instruction.

Dual Language Instruction for the Handicapped

The obligations of a school district under the 1974 Equal Education Act are to:

1. Develop a pedagogically sound program that addresses the child's English language needs;

2. Assure that students' substantive educational progress is not hindered by their English language deficit and that the program is

designed to assure that they ultimately bear no educational scars as a result of their lack of English language skills;

3. Provide all resources to assure success in the first two endeavors;

4. Assess the child regularly to substantiate the wisdom of the approach taken in the first two steps; and

5. To alter the program in a pedagogically sound manner if the assessment reflects a lack of success.

According to Roos (nd), these principles support the use of a bilingual approach in the education of handicapped children.

Failure to recommend native language instruction for handicapped LEP students may also be related to a common misconception that handicapped children who have limited English proficiency, or who are bilingual, should receive English only instruction (Ortiz, 1984). Educators reason that many exceptional children will have difficulty developing language skills, will require more time than other students to master a language, and will be confused by bilingual instruction. Recent research, however, suggests that instruction for language minority students should be consistent with what is known about language acquisition and about the relationship of native language development to English as a second language acquisition. According to Cummins (1981), for example, the native language is the means through which communicative competence in a second language is acquired. Submersion in a totally English language instructional program not only interferes with a natural developmental process (i.e., achievement of communicative competence and literacy in the native language), but may lead to cognitive and academic retardation.

For minority students who are at risk, strong promotion of native language conceptual skills will be more effective in providing a basis for the acquisition of literacy in English (Cummins, 1983). This point cannot be overemphasized given that reading, written expression and spelling were the goal areas most frequently specified for LD students across the three districts in this study and that the highest priority rankings for mentally retarded students were also in academic areas such as reading, language arts, and academic readiness skills. For the mentally retarded, the most frequently set goal fell into the category of oral expression/expressive language. That the level of second language competence is a function of the students' competence in the native language (Cummins, 1982) serves as a caution against submersion, English-only, special education services.

While there are many questions regarding bilingual development to be resolved by future research, a growing body of literature suggests that bilingual proficiency is not beyond the capability of handicapped students and that a policy of single-language instruction may ignore linguistic skills which are important to the child and to his/her community (Greenlee, 1981). Several studies have documented improvement or gains in achievement as a result of native language, English as a second language, or bilingual education strategies with handicapped LEP students (Ortiz, 1984):

1. Baca (1974) found that informal and structured bilingual interventions resulted in improvement of attitudes and achievement among 15 mildly handicapped students.

2. In a study of intellectually and physically handicapped children, Sanua (1976) found that 78% of the subjects showed progress in reading and 74% showed gains in self-concept when instruction was delivered bilingually.

3. Askins (1978) found that handicapped students involved in the Responsive Environment Early Education Program (REEEP) made significant gains in language development both in English and in Spanish and in school readiness. Sixty percent of the students scored better than estimated/expected on a test of English; 40% scored better than estimated/expected on a test of Spanish.

4. Bruck (1978), who studied the suitability of early French immersion programs for the learning disabled, found that English-speaking children with language problems who were placed in French immersion programs continued to develop facility in their first language, learned basic skills at the predicted rate, and exhibited no severe behavioral problems.

5. Weiss (1980) documented dramatic language-related learning improvement among 3 to 5 year old handicapped children participating in the Inreal Reactive Language (INREAL) program. Longitudinal data showed that students who had participated in the project had less need for follow-up remedial services and experienced fewer grade retentions.

6. McConnell (1981) described the use of Individualized Bilingual Instruction (IBI) for teaching academic areas and oral language in English and in Spanish. Gains for both high and low ability children were statistically significant.

These findings suggest the need for continued research to document student outcomes when special education is delivered in the native language, bilingually, utilizing English as a second language strategies, or when a student is submersed in a totally English-language program. In addition to the investigation of social, academic and other school-related outcomes, student characteristics must also be carefully monitored. Of interest is whether the effectiveness of interventions (including the language of instruction) and student outcomes vary with the handicapping condition and the level of severity.

Because it is possible that not all LEP students will profit from native language instruction, it is also important to develop criteria to determine which students should be served in bilingual special education programs. Unfortunately, research and knowledge related to exceptional limited English proficient students is so sparse that it is unlikely that such criteria could be established at the present time. This underscores the need for programmatic research such as that being conducted through the Handicapped Minority Research Institute on Language Proficiency at The University of Texas at Austin in order to develop a knowledge base associated with the interaction of language proficiency and handicapping conditions.

IEP Committees

While federal and state laws do not require that someone fluent in the child's native language serve on committees which develop IEPs, the impact of the child's social, linguistic, cultural, and other background characteristics must be considered in assessment, placement, and instructional decisions (Roos, nd). In a study of referral, assessment, and placement practices involving LEP Hispanic students, Ortiz et. al. (1985) found little evidence of participation of special program personnel (i.e., bilingual educators, ESL specialists, migrant teachers, etc.) on Admission, Review, and Dismissal (ARD) Committees charged with the responsibility of devloping a student's IEP. The absence of such perso may explain the lack of emphasis on native language instruction. Unles P committees include bilingual professionals with expertise in areas such as bilingual education, ESL, and educational planning and curriculum adaptation for exceptional language minorities, it is unlikely that IEPs will adequately address unique student attributes (e.g., cultural or socioeconomic differences) or that instructional programs will address the interaction of limited English proficiency and handicapping conditions. It is therefore recommended that all IEP commitees include a minimimum of one professional fluent in the child's language. Being bilingal, however, is not sufficient. This individual must also have expertise specific to the education of exceptional limited English proficient students.

Adaptation of IEP Forms

Failure to address the linguistic needs of handicapped LEPs may be an artifact of the forms used by local education agencies (LEAs) to develop IEPs. If, as in this study, districts use objective checklists or computerized IEPs and the objective lists or "banks" do not include goals and objectives related to the development of native language skills or to support English as a second language acquisition, committees may overlook the need to assure that goals and objectives are linguistically and culturally relevant. That IEP content did not differ for LEP and non-LEP students even for the district in which goals and objectives were written in longhand is further evidence that nothing on the form focuses attention on the child's LEP status and the possible need for native language or ESL instruction.

Examination of forms used by districts to develop IEPs reveals that these are designed for monolingual students. In some cases, space is provided to indicate the child's dominant language or LEP status; there are usually no other stimuli on the form to remind committee members that the student being considered is limited English proficient. A simple, albeit very helpful solution, would be for districts to develop IEP forms to be used when a handicapped student has limited mastery of English. In addition to the IEP components required by federal law and state policy, IEPs adapted for language minority students should include the following:

1. A summary of results of a current language proficiency assessment in the native language and in English and of the recommendations of the committee charged with determining student eligibility for special language programs (i.e., bilingual education, ESL, etc.). Ideally, a representative from the special language program committee would also serve on the special education IEP committee.

2. A statement describing current program placements with specific notation of whether the child is receiving native language and/or English as a second language instruction or whether s/he is in a classroom where instruction is provided totally in English. Also of interest is the prior history of native language and ESL services. Documentation of the language(s) being used in the mainstream program is important to assure compatibility of language use in delivering special education and related services. Otherwise, there is danger of confusing the child because of inconsistent language services. The IEP should also delineate the type of language program required (e.g. native language development, ESL instruction, language remediation, etc.)

3. Specialized materials, programs, and recommended strategies and approaches specific to the handicapping condition, first and second language proficiency levels, cultural, and other background characteristics must be recommended.

4. Instructional recommendations must also reflect understanding of preferred modalities, learning styles, and appropriate reinforcers.

Instructional Strategies

Research is needed to develop a taxonomy of effective instructional strategies and/or practices which can be used in educating exceptional LEP students. Such investigations would build upon existing research on instructional strategies for low-achieving pupils, handicapped and other special populations and on available literature on effective schools. Findings from studies of effective instruction for LEP students, for example, the Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study (Tikunoff, 1982), should be incorporated in these explorations. In addition to effective practices which can be used by bilingual special educators, a central focus of these investigations should be the identification of strategies which can be used by monolingual educators who serve handicapped LEP students. To date, these personnel are the primary service providers for exceptional language minorities.

Program Models

A significant aspect of needed research is a focus on program models to serve handicapped LEP students, including models for coordinating programs, personnel, and resources. It is also important to explore decisioning models which facilitate the development of IEPs which address the interaction of language proficiency and handicapping conditions.

Specialized Curricula and Materials

In 1979, Chinn conducted extensive literature searches in an effort to identify specialized curricula for handicapped, culturally different children. These searches yielded publications which addressed strategies and approaches appropriate for minorities, but none were specific to exceptional children. Five years later, Ortiz & Hernandez-Pound (1984) found that little progress had been made in this area. The characteristics and effectiveness of existing curricula and materials which are used in serving handicapped bilingual populations must be examined. Such studies would be helpful in providing well-documented

guidance for practitioners involved in development of instructional programs for handicapped language minority students.

State Policy

While both state and federal policy describe minimum procedures for safeguarding the rights of minority students in the special education referral, assessment, and placement process, little guidance is offered for designing individualized education programs. The state department should develop minimum compliance standards to assure that IEPs address not only the handicapping condition, but linguistic, cultural, and other sociocultural variables as well. Districts should be required to document "lack of feasibility" in providing native language special education services for handicapped LEPs. If they lack appropriate personnel, districts should also be required to submit affirmative action plans detailing how they will resolve this manpower shortage. Minimum standards for training of monolingual professionals who serve handicapped LEP students should also be established to assure that improved, albeit not ideal, services will be provided.

General Recommendations for Research

In addition to the recommendations made in the preceding sections, the following would also be fruitful lines of inquiry.

1. Adequate instruments and models have yet to be developed to capture the complex relationship between first and second language acquisition or to describe the relationship among variables such as attitudes and motivations of second language learners to attained proficiency (Johnson & Krug, 1980). The task of sorting out these relationships becomes even more complex with the addition of a handicapping condition. Research aimed at understanding the interaction of limited English proficiency and handicapping conditions is a requisite for improving the educational planning process.

2. Because of the multiplicity of variables which must be considered in choosing the language of instruction (e.g., nature and severity of the handicapping condition, prior educational history, parental preference, student motivation, etc.), a significant contribution to the bilingual special education field would be the development of a framework for weighing these variables in the educational/instructional decisioning process.

3. Because IEP content may be influenced by district curricula, studies of the efficacy of these curricula for LEP and non-LEP students must be conducted. Of specific interest is the quality of regular education and bilingual education services and how this quality affects referral and placement rates, as well as IEP development.

4. Data bases of situation-specific variables affecting instruction of handicapped LEP students in both special education and mainstream classes should be developed. These studies should document the implementation of student IEPs in both of these settings.

5. Studies of the effects of special education placement on academic, social, and other skill achievement of LEP students should be

conducted. It is hypothesized that these studies will document minimal gains despite special education intervention because specialized instruction is not adapted to accomodate linguistic differences. Given the lack of bilingual special education personnel, the efficacy of special education for language minority students can be seriously questioned.

Conclusions

Results of this study suggest that a student's level of English language proficiency exerts little influence on the areas targeted in that student's IEP. Further, native language instruction is infrequently incorporated into special education services. Given the limited guidance that law, policy and research literature provide special educators, who work with LEP handicapped students, it is not surprising that the majority of them are unable to individualize instruction so that it is consistent with students' language proficiency in the native and the English language(s).

Special education and related literature rarely present unique considerations in working with limited English proficient students. Further, when such considerations are addressed, information is usually gleaned from what is known about the handicapped in general, deduced from literature in related disciplines such as bilingual education or linguistics, or based on the intuitions and educated guesses of professionals. The state of the art, both in the construction of IEPs and in other aspects of bilingual special education, reflects the lack of empirical studies of exceptional language minorities. Until such research is conducted, it will not be possible to determine whether students who are both LEP and handicapped are receiving appropriate educational opportunities as required by law.

References

Askins, B. (1978). Responsive Environment Early Education Program (REEEP) Third-year evaluation study: Final evaluation report, 1977-1978. Santa Fe: New Mexico State Department of Education.

Baca, M. (1974). What's going on in the bilingual special education classroom? Teaching Exceptional Children, 7, 25.

Bickel, W. E. (1982). Classifying mentally retarded students: A review of placement practices in special education. In K. A. Heller, W. H. Holtzman & S. Messick (Eds.), Placing children in special education: A strategy for equity (pp. 182-229). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Bruck, M. (1978). The suitability of early French immersion programs for the language disabled child. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 34, 884-887.

Chinn, P. (1979). Curriculum development for culturally different exceptional children. Teacher Education and Special Education, 2(4), 49-58.

Cummins, J. (1981). Four misconceptions about language proficiency in bilingual education. Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education, 5(3), 31-45.

Cummins, J. (1982). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework. Los Angeles: Bilingual Education Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center.

Cummins, J. (1983). Bilingualism and special education: Program and pedagogical issues. Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 6, 373-386.

Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975. 20 U.S.C. Section 1400 et seq.

Equal Educational Act of 1974. 20 U.S.C. Section 1703 (f).

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine.

Greenlee, M. (1981). Specifying the needs of a 'bilingual' developmentally disabled population: Issues and case studies. The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education, 6(1), 55-76.

Johnson, T., & Krug, K. (1980). Integrative and instrumental motivations in search of a measure. In J. Oller & K. Perkins (Eds.), Research in language testing (pp. 241-249). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

McConnell, B. D. (1981). IBI (Individualized Bilingual Instruction): A validated program model effective with bilingual handicapped children. Paper presented at The Council for Exceptional Children Conference on the Exceptional Bilingual Child, New Orleans, LA.

McCormick, P. K., & Fisher, M. D. (1983, February). An analysis of individualized education program goals selected for learning disabled students. Paper presented at the International Association for Children with Learning Disabilities Conference, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 235 644)

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. H. (1975). SPSS: Statistical package for the social sciences, second edition. [Computer program]. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc.

Ortiz, A. A. (1984). Choosing the language of instruction for exceptional bilingual children. Teaching Exceptional Children, 16, 308-312.

Ortiz, A. A., Garcia, S. B., Holtzman, Jr., W. H., Polyzoi, E., Snell, Jr., W. E., Wilkinson, C. Y., & Willig, A. C. (1985). Characteristics of limited English proficient Hispanic students served in programs for the learning disabled: Implications for policy, practice and research. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Handicapped Minority Research Institute on Language Proficiency.

Ortiz, A. A., & Hernandez-Pound A. (1984). Curriculum and instruction for exceptional bilingual students. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Handicapped Minority Research Institute on Language Proficiency. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No. ED 261 482)

Ortiz, A. A., & Yates, J. R. (1983). Incidence of exceptionality among Hispanics: Implications for manpower planning. Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education, 7(3), 41-54.

Pyecha, J., Cox, J. L., Conway, L. E., Hocutt, A., Jaffe, J., Pelosi, J., & Wiegerink, R. (1980). A national survey of individualized education programs (IEPs) for handicapped children: Volume III (Basic Survey Findings). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 199 972)

Roos, P. D. (not dated). The handicapped limited-English-proficient student: A school district's obligation. (Available from the National Origin Desegregation Assistance Center, Coral Gables, Florida).

Safer, N., & Hobbs, B. (1980). Developing, implementing and evaluating individualized education programs. School Psychology Review, 9(3), 212-220.

Sanua, U. (1976). Bilingual programs for the physically handicapped, school year 1974-1975. Brooklyn: New York City Board of Education.

Schenck, S. J., & Levy, W. K. (1979, April). IEPs: The state of the art--1978. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 175 201)

Texas Education Agency, Department of Special Education. (1983). State Board of Education rules for handicapped students (including federal regulations and state law) (TEA Publication No. AD4 710 01). Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

Tikunoff, W. (1982). The Significant Bilingual Instructional Features descriptive study: Progress and issues from Part I. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

Turner, R. M., & Macy, D. J. (1978, February). A five year longitudinal study of IEP implementation. Paper presented at the Council for Exceptional Children's National Topical Conference on Individualized Educational Program Planning, Albuquerque, NM. (Cited in: Safer, N., & Hobbs, B. (1980). Developing, implementing and evaluating individualized education programs. School Psychology Review, 9(3), 212-220.

Weiss, R. (1980). Efficacy and cost effectiveness of an early intervention program for young handicapped children. Paper presented at the meeting of the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program (HCEEP) Project Directors, Washington, DC.